

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET'S WELCOME JAMES BROWN
BACK

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the Congress of the United States and the American people to recognize truly a living legend, James Brown, the "Godfather of Soul."

Mr. Brown is not only a legendary entertainer, but a humanitarian and social activist as well. He has overcome many personal and professional obstacles in his life to achieve professional greatness as a performer. Today I ask that we join together to congratulate Mr. Brown for overcoming another obstacle in his life; that is, ending his current incarceration in South Carolina. On February 27, 1991, the "Godfather of Soul" shall be presented for parole at a hearing before the Board of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services in Columbia, SC. He will soon be released after serving more than 2 years of his most productive life, in prison, for a nonviolent crime. Therefore, I ask for all Americans to join me in welcoming back a truly remarkable man with an amazing history.

He has served this Nation in many ways—he helped stop the riots after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; he advocated continuing education with his song "Don't Be a Dropout"; he instilled honor in millions with his song "Say It Loud; I'm Black and I'm Proud"; he toured Vietnam for our soldiers and recently played for troops on their way to the Persian Gulf war. His service to our community and the Nation will undoubtedly continue.

Additionally, I am submitting this article written by Susan Broili which appeared on February 10, 1991, in the Herald Sun newspaper in Durham, NC, on Mr. Brown for those who do not know the man or his contributions to the music industry and social causes. Also I wish to thank Larry Friddle, Thomas A. Hart, Jr., Phillip Jones, Miranda Lewis, Skip Kelly, Stephen Fleming, and the rest of the staff of On the Potomac Productions, who produced the television special "James Brown: The Man, the Music and the Message." This special brings out the essence of James Brown and what his life has meant to three generations of Americans. I urge my colleagues to view the program when it is broadcast in their local areas:

JAILED JAMES BROWN PLANS HIS COMEBACK
(By Susan Broili)

Ah-a-a-ow!

Mention the name James Brown and jump back 'cause folks are liable to get funky—drop everything, let out a soul scream and break into their own version of "I Feel Good."

For nearly four decades, Brown's gut-wrenching screams and visceral lyrics, delivered in a raspy, buzz-saw voice and backed by pulsing rhythms and staccato horns, have made millions of fans FEEL G-O-O-D.

Made them do the Jerk, Mashed Potatoes, Funky Chicken and try to do the Camel Walk by watching Brown—his legs vibrating as he snaked backwards, on one foot, across the stage.

These days, the Godfather of Soul feels good himself, despite the fact that he is currently serving a six-year prison term in Aiken, S.C., for aggravated assault and failure to stop for police. He has already served two years and has a parole hearing set for Feb. 27.

Last week, in a telephone interview from his work-release job at the Aiken/Barnwell Counties Community Action Commission, he talked about the "real story" of what led to his arrest, his time in jail, future plans and past career—including some memories of performing in Durham.

"I got real sick one time in Durham," said Brown. "I had a touch of heart trouble. I was staying at the Biltmore Hotel across the tracks. A doctor came and gave me digitalis. I took it for 14 years."

Brown and his group, the Famous Flames, played the Chitlin Circuit: armory, high school, ball park and tobacco warehouses in places such as Durham, Kinston and Burlington.

"One of the Famous Flames—Bobby Byrd—Is from Burlington," said Brown, recalling the June German Balls as an annual gig on the circuit. He also remembered playing Dorton Arena in Raleigh—a town mentioned in his song, "Night Train." Brown's career got on track in 1956 with his first hit, "Please, Please, Please." During the past 30 years, he has put 44 singles into the Top 40, including such soul classics as "Night Train," "I Got You (I Feel Good)," "Cold Sweat," "Sex Machine" and "Papa's Got a Brand New Bag." His hits earned him number two on the all-time Pop Charts—after Elvis.

Recordings are one thing. James Brown "live" is another. "No one alive has ever performed like this man," said Dick Clark, in the recent documentary James Brown: The Man, The Music & The Message, which aired last Saturday in the Triangle.

Clark recalled a show in which an English group waited in the wings to follow Brown. "We had to pull them onstage." The group was the Rolling Stones.

"Who wants to follow James Brown?" said Clark.

Most, however, will readily admit to Brown's influence on their music. In the documentary, several paid tribute.

"He's the man who was at the foundation of rock and roll," said Bobby Brown. He taught us how to scoot across the stage."

Michael Jackson's fascination with Brown began at a young age; he did a James Brown song and dance when he auditioned for Berry Gordy, founder of Motown Records.

Little Richard, who met Brown in 1943, reminisced about the early days: "We all wanted to go far, and we didn't even have a

car. We just kept on screaming, we just kept on dreaming."

For his own reasons, Brown would not reveal the date or place of his birth when he talked to the The Herald-Sun last week. Some sources put it in 1928 in Pulaski, Tenn., others in 1933 near Aiken, S.C. When he is released from prison, he will return to his 40-acre spread a mile down a dirt road in Beech Island, S.C., 10 miles from Augusta, Ga., where his third wife, Adrienne, lives.

Their relationship has been stormy. Police have been called to the house numerous times and Brown has been arrested twice for domestic violence. An Aiken sheriff has reported the couple shooting at each other.

"It's like any marriage in the world," Brown said. "You have ups and downs. . . . My wife and I are fine."

Brown grew up poor, dropping out of school in the seventh grade to help his family.

"We were not on welfare, he said. "We were proud of what we had. The Bible says: 'A man should live by the sweat of his brow.'"

Brown delivered groceries, shined shoes, worked on a farm. He also buckdanced for nickles and dimes, earning \$5 a month.

Brown talks about self-determination when he speaks to young people as part of his work-release job at the Aiken/Barnwell Counties Community Action Commission. He's been on the job there since last fall.

"I was offered TV jobs, high-technology jobs," said Brown, of the work-release program. "I wanted to get back in the community, a pet project, where my heart is." As part of his job, he works with children in the Headstart program, with teenagers and the elderly.

"My pet project has always been education. If you know it, you don't have to do it. We try seminar held in an office next to his in Augusta. He reportedly was carrying a shotgun and said: 'Why are you all using my bathroom?'"

Brown claims he was going to his office, noticed it had been broken into, and was on his way to report the break-in to the sheriff's office when police started pursuing his pickup.

"I wasn't fleeing. I was going to see the sheriff," Brown said. "People know me everywhere," he said, listing a string of foreign countries. "Where was I fleeing to?"

A Georgia sheriff pursued him to the South Carolina line, and when Brown didn't stop, South Carolina authorities took up the pursuit.

His defense attorneys said Brown stopped at an intersection, but drove off when he became frightened after deputies broke the window of his pickup.

He was out on bond the next day but was arrested in Augusta again—this time in a Lincoln—and charged with driving under the influence of drugs. Tests showed PCP in his blood. A South Carolina judge sentenced him to a six-year term for failure to stop for police and a Georgia judge gave him a concurrent prison term for charges ranging from carrying a deadly weapon to reckless driving.

"I could have walked away from my incarceration after serving 90 days if I had pleaded guilty," Brown said. "There was never noth-

* This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ing involved but a traffic violation. Unfortunately for me, I didn't have Matlock or Perry Mason."

He's used time in prison to "just relax. I've been on the road for 35 years. I never stopped to take a real rest."

If his time in prison has healed his body, Brown believes his soul is in good shape, too. In the documentary, he said:

"I've still got my faith, still got my dignity, still got my integrity . . . still got my soul."

His belief in education has been reinforced by observing fellow inmates, many of whom never completed high school.

"It's shown me a lot of basic problems in the community. The basic problem is education and love for each other. If you've got God, you've got love. You need a real education. With education, you can become independent instead of dependent."

Being in prison has also given him a chance to get closer to fans—an experience most superstars don't have, Brown said: "He'll see them and be waving and going."

He and some of his "fans" have been singing together in prison.

"We put together our own group [a gospel quartet]. I led some singing groups. Any soul singer, country singer started with gospel. It all goes back to gospel."

"You've got to be proud of this country and proud of yourself," said Brown, who gave a Christmas show at Fort Jackson, S.C. and believes Americans should show support for troops. "I try to live like Kennedy says: 'It's not what your country can do for you, it's what you can do for your country.'"

"I'm a countryman and a statesman. Without a country, you can have no home."

The state of his country frustrates him, though. "People selling drugs to corruption of police officers. . . . I want to clean the music up. The lyrics are terrible. I don't believe what I'm hearing."

After he's released from prison, he said, "I'll probably go to Saudi Arabia, I've already talked to Sen. Strom Thurmond and also the State Department. I'll sing for five generations."

Since his parole is pending he would not mention other concerts. But according to Phillip Jones, of On the Potomac Productions (which produced the TV documentary). "His first concert will probably be in South Carolina."

Brown says his band will include Fred Wesley and others who were with him before he went to prison. He expects his next album to be out in June or July. He says he wrote all of the songs in prison, but would not reveal content or titles. He did say the songs will sound like James Brown, but will be a new universal form of music.

And in his usual, "low-key fashion, Brown added: It'll be dynamite."

MRS. EVELYN A. REEVES ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BROKERS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to honor Mrs. Evelyn A. Reeves on her election as the 16th president and CEO of the National Association of Real Estate Bro-

kers. Mrs. Reeves is the first woman to head the organization in its 42-year history.

This proud Californian and accomplished professional is a graduate of California State University in Los Angeles, where she received a bachelor of arts in business administration.

Mr. Speaker, as a testimony to Mrs. Reeves' business acumen, she currently serves as president of the REL-OM Corp., and is the property manager of the First Security Investment Co. Mr. Speaker, in spite of her busy business schedule, Evelyn Reeves consistently finds time to aid in the growth of her community. She serves on the State of California Housing Advisory Board, the mayor's housing task force, and the Los Angeles Southwest College Real Estate Advisory Committee. Mrs. Reeves is an active member of Peoples Independent Church.

Citizens of Los Angeles and the Nation benefit from the outstanding contributions of Mrs. Evelyn A. Reeves. Mrs. Reeves, I urge you to continue your work at your usual high level of sincerity and professionalism.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALAMEDA FIREFIGHTERS CHARLIE DANIELS, WILLIAM BUELL, AND JAMES RITCHEY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate three firefighters from the city of Alameda in California's Ninth Congressional District. These three men are being honored at the Alameda Fire Fighters Association 1991 Awards Dinner.

Charles M. Daniels is receiving the Valor Award for a recently performed courageous and heroic deed. While driving off-duty on July 8, 1990, he witnessed an automobile accident. His lifesaving actions resulted in the rescue of a mother and her two sons, ages 5 and 1 years old.

William Robert Buell, Jr., is being honored for this dedicated efforts on behalf of the Firefighters Union. Mr. Buell continuously donates his time and energy to the union and has organized and assisted with the union computer operations.

James N. Ritchey is receiving the Community Service Award for 1991. His off-duty time is taken up with such things as playing Santa Claus for the local homeless shelter, serving as the liaison and organizer for the Park Street Art and Wine Faire and, serving as a trustee for the Jennifer Olson Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this opportunity to recognize these three men, Charles Daniels, William Buell, and James Ritchey for their continued dedication and service to our community. Not only do they risk their lives on the job, but they also unselfishly serve the community when they are off-duty.

IRA FUNDS

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which would remove a disincentive in the tax laws for limited use of IRA funds for the first time purchase of a home. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleagues Mr. SCHULZE from Pennsylvania and Mr. BONIOR from Michigan. The proposal which I am introducing today is similar to measures proposed by President Bush, but with one significant modification: This proposal would permit withdrawals on a penalty-free basis from existing IRA's for first time home purchases by not only the home buyer, but also by their spouse, parent, or grandparent. Since the IRA account balances of older taxpayers, such as parents and grandparents, tend to have a larger account balance than those of younger taxpayers, I believe that this proposal would help reverse the decline of homeownership in this country, especially among the prime home buying ages of 25 to 34 years old. In many cases these individuals are able to support a conventional mortgage, but are simply unable to set aside the needed funds for a down payment. Our Federal housing programs are primarily designed to assist home buyers who do not have an income sufficient to support a conventional mortgage. This proposal is a critical supplement to our current housing policy since it removes a barrier which needlessly restricts the ability of these young individuals and families to assemble the funds for the down payment on their first home.

Under this proposal, a taxpayer, as well as his or her spouse, parent or grandparent would be allowed to withdraw up to \$10,000 collectively to make a first time purchase of a home. While the proposal would exempt withdrawn funds from the 10-percent penalty that is currently imposed under the income tax laws for premature withdrawals, any amounts withdrawn for first time home purchases would be considered taxable income to the IRA account holder. The definition of a qualified first time home buyer would include any taxpayer who did not own an interest in a principal residence for the past 3 years. In addition, the purchase price of a home acquired with withdrawn IRA funds could not exceed 110 percent of the average area purchase price.

There is no question this country faces a critical problem in the area of housing affordability. During the previous decade, we witnessed a steady decline in the Nation's homeownership rate, reversing a 40-year trend of rising homeownership in this country. A particularly disturbing trend is that the largest decrease in homeownership was noticed by those under 25 years of age, and by those between the ages of 25 and 34. The combined homeownership rate of these two age groups declined by roughly 15 percent during the 1980's. Various studies have cited the inability of young people to save enough money for a down payment as the single most compelling problem preventing these individuals from buying a home.

Mr. Speaker, investing IRA funds in a home is a very prudent investment. In addition, use of an IRA account to acquire a residence is totally consistent with the overall retirement purpose that IRA's were intended to serve. While adoption of this measure is not a panacea for curing the Nation's housing affordability epidemic, this legislation does constitute a positive, important first step.

IN HONOR OF DR. WILLIAM F.
"BILL" FITZGERALD ON HIS RE-
TIREMENT

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my warmest congratulations to William F. "Bill" Fitzgerald on an outstanding career in education and community service. He retires this year after 23 years on the faculty of Loyola Marymount University, his alma mater, in the department of political science.

Born November 22, 1924 in Chicago, IL, Bill Fitzgerald graduated from Herbert Hoover High School in Glendale, CA, and attended Glendale City College prior to earning his bachelor of science degree in political science from Loyola Marymount University in 1948. Fitzgerald next attended graduate school at the University of California at Los Angeles from 1949 to 1950. Four years later, he was awarded the Ph.D. degree from Georgetown University, in political science.

Throughout his career, Bill has been outspoken on issues of human rights, both domestic and international. Bill has served on the Los Angeles County Human Relations Board, the Los Angeles Urban League, the commission on human relations, and the police community relations workshop. For 20 years, he was director of the Loyola Human Relations Workshop.

An organizing member of the California task force for integration in education, Bill has represented Loyola Marymount on faculty concerned about human rights in El Salvador. He was a consultant and lecturer for the human relations commission of Los Angeles County and social welfare conferences in California and nationwide. He is also a founding member of the Catholic Human Relations Council.

In addition, Bill served as director of the California Museum of Science and Industry and as executive secretary of the California Museum Foundation for 5 years. He has taught at Fordham University, Marquette University, the University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles State University College, and Mount Saint Mary's College in Maryland, and he has lectured before numerous community organizations and corporations in and beyond California.

Bill is a member of several professional associations and boards including the Southern California Political Science Association, the Western Political Science Association and the American Political Science Association and the board of trustees of Immaculate Heart College in Los Angeles.

Throughout his lengthy teaching career, and beginning well before the mass civil rights

movement of the 1960's inspired widespread optimism, Bill evinced a firm faith in the ability of the American system of government to right past wrongs and to accommodate positive and lasting change with respect to discrimination in employment, housing, and education.

In addition to raising his own voice, Bill has been supportive of students speaking out on issues ranging from support for farm workers, United States involvement in Central America, sanctions against apartheid, the drug war, the Iran-Contra scandal, and Vietnam. Bill has touched and inspired the lives of thousands of students who have adopted his commitment to fairness and given life to it as teachers, lawyers, judges, elected officials, and in any number of other professions.

Bill Fitzgerald stands as a shining example of what is great about our Nation's educational system. On the occasion of his well-deserved retirement, I invite you to join me, Mr. Speaker, in wishing for Bill, his wife, Martha, and his 11 children good health and good times in the years ahead.

THE STUDENT LOAN DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 1991

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Student Loan Default Prevention Act of 1991. This bill is meant to confront the urgent problem of defaults on student loans that rob the federally guaranteed Student Loan Program of available funds that could be used to help pay for the higher education of many deserving students.

We in Congress must take immediate action to stem the flow of the billions of dollars now required to guarantee these student loans. The statistics are startling. Estimates place the cost of paying for defaulted loans at \$2.4 billion for fiscal 1990. This figure is equal to 40 percent of total program outlays.

The bill that is introduced today attacks the default problem on several fronts. It was drafted with the belief that a solution to the default situation will require greater responsibility on the part of everyone involved—students, schools, lenders and guarantee agencies—to ensure that these loans are repaid.

Since estimates show that learning institutions with high rates of default—rates of 20 percent or more—are responsible for nearly half of all student loan defaults, my bill places its major emphasis on making these institutions more accountable to the guaranteed loan system. Institutions defined as having a high rate of default will not receive disbursement of Federal funds sooner than 30 days after the beginning of the school term. In addition, disbursement of the loan will be made in at least two installments to coincide with the beginning of each term of study. These provisions are necessary because the majority of defaults are attributable to students that drop out during the first term of their first year of school.

My bill will also place more responsibility on lending institutions and guarantee agencies by modifying the 100-percent Federal guarantee

provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965. I do not advocate the elimination of the 100-percent guarantee, but I believe that lending institutions should share the risk incurred when making loans to those enrolling in high default rate schools. My bill provides that the Federal guarantee will be reduced to 95 percent when a lender under this act has one-third or more of its outstanding student loan principal during any consecutive 2-year period with students attending high default rate schools. This is a reasonable approach to encourage lenders to more actively evaluate the risk potential of student loans, while taking into consideration the voluntary nature of their participation in the program and the slim profit margins and high overhead involved with making student loans.

Finally, the Student Loan Default Prevention Act of 1991 places limitations on the recruitment activity and false advertising pursued by some unscrupulous schools. The bill contains several provisions to prevent schools from taking advantage of potential students and to strengthen the accrediting standards and procedures for career training schools.

I urge my colleagues to join me in seeing that we move swiftly to stop the hemorrhaging of our Student Loan Program. We must take every measure to ensure that scarce Federal student aid resources are made available to as many of our deserving and aspiring students as possible.

NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL SUP- PORTS PUERTO RICO PLEBI- SCITE

HON. JAIME B. FUSTER

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. FUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I again want to point out to my colleagues in both the House and Senate an important national issue which we in both Chambers will no doubt be called upon to consider again this year. It is the matter of a congressionally sanctioned political status plebiscite in Puerto Rico which would be held late this year between the choices of statehood, independence, and an enhancement of the existing commonwealth status, which, as you know, I favor.

Many articles, opinion columns and editorials have appeared in the national press about this matter, Mr. Speaker, and Members of Congress in both bodies have also debated the issue at length. Today I want to share with my colleagues some perceptive and trenchant thoughts which appeared as the lead editorial, entitled, "America's Captive Nation," in the New York Times of February 22, 1991:

AMERICA'S CAPTIVE NATION

How perverse it would be if American politicians who upbraid Mikhail Gorbachev for ignoring Lithuania's independence plebiscite were to refuse Puerto Rico the same right of expression. But that's exactly what seems to be happening in the U.S. Senate.

Discovered by Columbus, colonized by Spain, seized as war booty by the United States, Puerto Rico qualifies as the oldest colony in this Hemisphere. Like the Baltic states, it was involuntarily annexed by a big

neighbor. But unlike the Baltics, most Puerto Ricans favor continued association with their distant overlords, as 51st state or as a partly autonomous commonwealth.

In a world boiling with ethnic discord, Puerto Rico is enviably free of rage and persistent violence. Yet Puerto Ricans are justly furious at Washington's unwillingness to provide a free and fair referendum this year in which Puerto Ricans could finally determine whether to seek statehood, choose continued commonwealth autonomy or, as a minority wishes, become independent.

If there is to be a plebiscite in 1991, Congress must act by early July. Chairman J. Bennett Johnston of the Senate Energy Committee, vowing to meet that deadline, has already held hearings on legislation that would carefully define the choices. This is very different from a House bill that simply lists the options, without elaboration, inviting angry misunderstandings.

But Mr. Johnston's draft bill may well be killed by lawmakers who like self-determination—in the Baltics. After all, says Don Nickles, an Oklahoma Republican, Puerto Ricans might not "blend" with the U.S. if they chose statehood. Exactly, says Wendell Ford, a Kentucky Democrat, who describes Puerto Rico as that sinister thing, a "separate culture." Malcolm Wallop, Republican of Wyoming, is all for letting Puerto Ricans hold a referendum as long as Congress can ignore the results.

These are wounding arguments. Cultural, ethnic and religious differences were once cited by bigots who opposed statehood for Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah and Oklahoma. Nobody spoke of a "separate culture" when Puerto Ricans were drafted to fight in past wars. Nobody says the 15,000 Puerto Ricans serving in the Persian Gulf now do not "blend in."

Finally, it verges on the dishonorable to invite Puerto Ricans to hold a referendum without assurance that Congress will heed the results—especially so when the invitation comes from Mr. Wallop, whose President and party favor statehood. Every President starting with Eisenhower has affirmed Puerto Rico's right to choose. That commitment was repeated time and again in the U.N. New York's Senator Daniel P. Moynihan recalls that it was once his job as U.S. envoy to ridicule Fidel Castro's claim that Americans would never allow Puerto Ricans freedom of choice.

Charting Puerto Rico's future will require hard legislative work and much good will. But Puerto Ricans did not ask to be annexed. They were compelled to become part of the U.S. by a process far less brutal but very like the Soviet absorption of the Baltics. It is both honorable and politically wise to permit this captive nation to decide its status freely, fairly—and promptly.

IT'S TIME TO SALUTE THE HAMMER

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Californian, who is well on his way to becoming one of the most successful entertainers in the world. M.C. Hammer has brought rap music and the urban beat into the homes of millions of Americans.

With the help of dazzling videos that show off his mind-boggling dance steps, his "Please Hammer Don't Hurt Em," album topped every other LP in sales last year. Hammer and his crew of at least 30 other entertainers, last year, began a 250-concert world tour which included stops in the United States, Europe, Japan, Australia, and the Caribbean.

This native of Oakland, CA, or "Oaktown" has gained the respect of the music industry through numerous awards including five 1991 American Music Awards for Favorite Rap Artist; Favorite Soul/R&B Single for "U Can't Touch This"; Favorite Rap Album and Favorite Soul/R&B Male Artist. Hammer also received five Grammy nominations this year, one of the most prestigious awards in the music industry.

In addition to his musical success, the Hammer is also heralded as an astute businessman. Hammer took an original \$20,000 investment by two members of the Oakland A's baseball team and formed his own label, "Bust It" records. The resulting album "Feel My Power," sold more than 60,000 copies. Recently, Hammer and his Oakland-based record company signed a multimillion dollar deal with Capitol Records, with plans for Hammer to produce albums for 10 new groups.

The story of Hammer's rise to stardom is truly a rags to riches tale. Born Stanley Kirk Burrell, he spent his early years in Oakland, living in a 3-bedroom Government-subsidized apartment with his mother, father, and six siblings. Hammer always displayed a talent for mastering difficult dance moves. One day while emulating his idol, James Brown, outside the Oakland coliseum he attracted the attention of the baseball team's owner, Charlie Finley. Finley was amused by the young Hammer's style. He made Hammer the team's batboy and allowed him to travel with the A's and to hang out with the players.

Although Hammer knew at an early age that he was talented as well as a good businessman, he was forced to make a decision about his future direction after an unsuccessful attempt at obtaining a bachelors degree in communications. Like so many of his friends, Hammer knew he could easily use his skills to make thousands of dollars overnight in the illegal drug trade. Instead, he took a different path by joining the Navy. After 3 years of service he came back to his hometown and started setting up his musical enterprise that has turned the world of rap music upside down and made him a household name.

Hammer's stage show is filled with nonstop singing, dancing, jamming, and excitement. The audience is pulled into the groove and it doesn't stop until all are exhausted. The success of the road show, is partly due to the 30 or so members of Hammer's posse that keep up with every move devised by the master. To Hammer, however, his dancers are more than employees. He says he feels a real responsibility to make sure the group, especially the younger members, don't get caught up in the trappings of success. Hammer runs a tight ship, enforcing curfews for his dancers and even encouraging them to share living quarters back in Oakland. Hammer even offers to pick up many of their household expenses.

With so many accomplishments under his belt, this 27-year-old rapper could easily be tempted to ride the crest of his fame. Ham-

mer, however, says he's still working just as hard today as he did back when he was riding 14 guys around in a van from gig to gig.

Future projects include plans to make a long form video, which include five tracks from his latest album. "Here Comes the Hammer" and "Yo! Sweetness" are presented in ensemble dance production numbers, and several of Bust It's new recording artists are featured in the video as well. Other plans include a fall tour possibly sponsored by MTV and an action-comedy film called "Pressure." The storyline will follow Hammer as he returns home to Oakland, and confronts the local drug dealer, who has put the lives of the community's children in danger.

I salute M.C. Hammer and Oaktown for nurturing his talent as well as many of today's popular recording artists, including: Too Short, Oaktown 3-5-7, Tony, Toni, Tone and En Vogue.

HONORING HENRY OSSIAN FLIPPER

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring attention to an outstanding American, Henry Ossian Flipper. Henry Flipper was born into slavery, but managed to overcome this devastating hardship to become the first African-American to graduate from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. As a second lieutenant in the all Negro 10th Cavalry Regiment, Lieutenant Flipper was a surveyor and construction supervisor.

After his honorable discharge in 1882, Flipper was subsequently employed by the Department of the Interior. He was responsible for the location, construction, and operation of Alaskan railroads.

Mr. Speaker, because of Henry Flipper's triumph over the extreme disadvantages of slavery and racism and his outstanding engineering accomplishment, I am introducing a joint resolution that provides for the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp in honor of Henry Ossian Flipper. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring a true American success story.

SUPPORT H.R. 830, THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION ENFORCEMENT ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Enforcement Act (H.R. 830). This legislation would impose import sanctions on foreign firms furthering the spread of nuclear weapons. Any foreign company that sells—without requiring proper safeguards—equipment, materials, or technology used in the manufacturing of nuclear weapons will have its goods barred from entering the United States.

I wish it hadn't come to this. I wish there were a quieter, less confrontational way we could accomplish the same goals. But we've tried the quiet approach for a long time and we can see the dismal results. Over the last two decades India, Pakistan, Israel, South Africa, Brazil, and Argentina have all used the assistance of Western companies to develop advanced nuclear weapons programs.

Most of these countries now have the capability to build the bomb and several have assembled arsenals. These developments raise a host of frightening scenarios, such as regional nuclear wars in the Middle East or Sub-Continent, terrorists threatening entire cities through nuclear blackmail. As more countries acquire the bomb, more nuclear suppliers will emerge, and we'll have even less means to control them.

For example, General Zia-ul-Haq, former President of Pakistan, speaking in an interview in 1986 had this to say about his country's nuclear weapons program: "It is our right to obtain the technology. And when we acquire this technology, the entire Islamic World will possess it with us." If this doesn't scare you, then I don't know what will.

Which leads us to the most terrifying scenario of all—Saddam Hussein armed with nuclear weapons. With Operation Desert Storm we've dealt Baghdad a significant setback to its atomic weapons program. But Iraq could resume its efforts, just as it did after the Israeli raid on the Osiraq nuclear reactor in 1981. Additionally, Syria, Iran, and Libya might well follow in Saddam's nuclear footsteps.

Yet for years we ignored Iraq's and other countries' nuclear ambitions, while companies from all over the developed world, but especially Germany, helped these countries build the necessary nuclear facilities. We tried quietly urging our allies to tighten and better enforce their nuclear export controls. The results are best described in an article that appeared last August in the German newsweekly *Der Spiegel*:

Far more than a thousand times the Americans have briefed the German services and high-ranking Bonn ministry officials about sensitive arms deals with the Middle East, the Far East, and South America over the past six years. . . . Not much has been done as a consequence. Many of the written warnings, which have been declared so-called nonpapers in Bonn, immediately ended up in the trash can.

Since that time Germans have talked much of new and better enforced export regulations. And yet, as late as last fall dozens of German firms were violating the Iraq embargo. Again, despite our quiet protestations, Bonn stood by while the sanctions were critically weakened and war became a more likely possibility. It was only when allegations against German companies surfaced in the media that the German Government started to take any action against the embargo cheaters. But we are less concerned about seeing export violators punished than in having the violations prevented in the first place.

My legislation will help send a strong consistent message to our allies that if they cannot or will not control their exporters, then the United States will step in and do the job for them. H.R. 830 is the product of months of work after consultation with leading experts in

the nuclear nonproliferation field as well as scholars in international law. This is a workable approach which, I strongly believe, will create strong incentives for both foreign companies and foreign governments to get their acts together. Governments will wish to avoid the embarrassment of having their companies publicly and visibly named as assisting nuclear proliferation. Firms, especially large multinational conglomerates such as Daimler-Benz, will have strong incentives to more closely monitor the dealing of their many subsidiaries when confronted with the prospect of losing access to the world's richest single market.

This approach is not really extraterritorial. If the country concerned has effective measures to prevent proliferation and has imposed the appropriate penalties on the company concerned, then sanctions would not be imposed. Our allies have made an internationally binding commitment to prevent nuclear proliferation. It's only when they fail to carry through on this commitment that the sanctions would occur. No export controls will be perfectly leak-proof: We just expect our allies to make a good-faith effort. Further, the companies named as violators will have an opportunity to present their case, as they may appeal the President's decision to the U.S. Court of International Trade.

Nor would this legislation violate U.S. obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. Article 21 of GATT contains a very clear exception for cases of this kind. The article reads in part:

Nothing in this agreement shall be construed . . .

(b) to prevent any contracting party from taking any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests

(i) relating to fissionable materials or the materials from which they are derived;

(ii) relating to the traffic in arms, ammunition and implements of war and to such traffic in other goods and materials as is carried on directly or indirectly for the purpose of supplying a military establishment.

The violations that would trigger the sanctions are also very specifically defined in the bill. A company commits a violation if it (A) sells nuclear items without getting the safeguard guarantees mandated by U.S. law, (B) retransfers nuclear items exported from the United States without U.S. permission, (C) sells nuclear items to countries which do not have international safeguards on all of their nuclear facilities, such as India and Pakistan, or (D) sells certain nuclear dual-use technology to a controlled country. A controlled country is one which is not party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, has violated an agreement made with the International Atomic Energy Agency, has made efforts to build nuclear weapons clandestinely, or has repeatedly provided support for international terrorism.

If these guidelines are carefully adhered to by the major international nuclear suppliers, we can significantly slow the spread of nuclear weapons. If not, further nuclear proliferation is only a matter of time.

This legislation, while strict and specific on what triggers the sanctions, provides maximum flexibility for the President to administer them. The administration will determine when

violations have taken place and how long the import ban should occur, though it must be imposed for at least 2 years. The President may waive the sanction altogether, if he deems such a step essential for U.S. national security, but he must notify Congress 20 days in advance and provide the rationale for doing so.

On the other hand, the legislation would not bar the importation of defense articles, spare parts, maintenance services, or component parts, in cases in which no reasonable alternative is available. We don't wish to put our own economic or national security at risk.

Finally, the legislation includes a "privatization" clause to take advantage of the many fine people working in the nuclear nonproliferation field outside of government. Any person may petition the government to investigate a foreign company for its involvement in nuclear proliferation. They would have to show significant probable cause and it would then be up to the administration to decide whether to pursue the case. This section is modeled closely on similar petition clauses in several U.S. trade laws.

This legislation is specific, flexible, just, and effective. And, it has ample precedent. H.R. 830 very closely parallels—almost word for word at points—the missile technology sanctions passed in the Defense bill last fall. If the President could sign that legislation, he should find this bill acceptable as well. The only losers in this legislation are the proliferation profiteers and weak-kneed governments which refuse to stand up to them.

Mr. Speaker, the advanced industrial countries have, at this point in history, a choice of how best to pursue nuclear nonproliferation. We can either apply strict export controls on nuclear items as a preventative measure or periodically take military action on the scale of Operation Desert Storm. I think most would prefer to take the former approach.

The following is the full text of H.R. 830.

H.R. 830

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Nuclear Non-Proliferation Enforcement Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. IMPOSITION OF SANCTION.

(a) BASIS FOR SANCTION.—The President shall impose the sanction set forth in subsection (c) on a foreign person if the President determines that such foreign person knowingly—

(1)(A) exports, transfers, or is otherwise engaged in the trade of any nuclear materials and equipment or nuclear technology—

(i) which violates paragraph (4) of section 127 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2156(4));

(ii) which fails to meet all the criteria set forth in section 127 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, except that for purposes of this clause references in paragraphs (4) and (5) of such section to the United States shall be deemed to refer to the exporting country; or

(iii) to any non-nuclear-weapon state that does not meet the requirements of non-nuclear-weapon states that are set forth in section 104(d) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (22 U.S.C. 3223(d)); or

(B) has knowingly or materially contributed—

(i) through the export, transfer, or other engagement in the trade of any goods or technology that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and controlled under the Export Administration Act of 1979 pursuant to section 309(c) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978, because of their significance for nuclear explosive purposes, or

(ii) through the export, transfer, or other engagement in the trade of any goods or technology that would be, if they were subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, controlled under the Export Administration Act of 1979 pursuant to section 309(c) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978, because of their significance for nuclear explosive purposes,

to the efforts by any foreign country described in subsection (b) to use, develop, produce, stockpile, or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons; or

(2) conspires or attempts to engage in or knowingly assists in an export, or in a transfer or trade, described in paragraph (1).

(b) COUNTRIES RECEIVING ASSISTANCE.—The countries referred to in subsection (a)(1)(B) are—

(1) any non-nuclear-weapon state that the President determines has, at any time after January 1, 1980—

(A) used a nuclear weapon;
(B) tested a nuclear weapon;
(C) produced a nuclear weapon; or
(D) made substantial preparations to engage in any activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

(2) any foreign country which has not ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and concluded an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency for the application of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all the country's nuclear facilities;

(3) any foreign country which has violated such an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency relating to safeguards; and

(4) any foreign country whose government is determined for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for international terrorism.

(c) SANCTION.—The sanction which applies to a foreign person under subsection (a) is that the President shall prohibit, for a period of at least 2 years, the entry into the customs territory of the United States of any article that is the growth, product, or manufacture of that foreign person.

(d) EXPANSION OF SANCTION TO OTHER ENTITIES.—The President shall impose the sanction imposed on a foreign person under this section on any other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, that foreign person.

SEC. 3. ANNUAL DETERMINATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT; APPEAL OF DETERMINATIONS.

(a) DETERMINATIONS.—The President shall, at least once each year, determine which, if any, foreign persons have carried out acts described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2(a). The President shall publish all such determinations in the Federal Register. The President shall impose the sanction required by section 2 upon making such determination.

(b) APPEALS.—Any person who the President determines has carried out any act described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 2(a), may obtain review of the determination by filing an appeal, within 60 days after the determination is published in the Federal Reg-

ister, in the United States Court of International Trade, which shall have jurisdiction to review such determination.

SEC. 4. EFFECT OF ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS BY OTHER COUNTRIES.

The sanction set forth in section 2 may not be imposed under such section on a foreign person with respect to acts described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 2(a), and any such sanction that is in effect against a foreign person on account of such acts shall be terminated, if—

(1) the country from which the export, transfer, or other act originates has in effect laws restricting the export, transfer, or other activity in a manner substantially similar to the restrictions imposed by United States laws or regulations on such exports, transfers, or other acts,

(2) the foreign person is subject to those laws, and

(3) the country has imposed on that foreign person the appropriate penalties pursuant to those laws.

SEC. 5. ADVISORY OPINIONS.

The President may, upon the request of any person, issue an advisory opinion to that person of whether a proposed activity by that person would subject that person to the sanction under section 2. Any person who relies in good faith on such advisory opinion which states that the proposed activity would not subject a person to such sanction, and any person who thereafter engages in such activity, may not be made subject to such sanction on account of such activity.

SEC. 6. WAIVER AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) WAIVER.—In any case other than one in which an advisory opinion has been issued under section 5 stating that a proposed activity would not subject a person to the sanction under section 2, the President may waive the application of section 2 to a foreign person if the President determines that such waiver is essential to the national security of the United States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—In the event that the President decides to apply the waiver described in subsection (a), the President shall so notify the Congress not less than 20 working days before issuing the waiver. Such notification shall include a report fully articulating the rationale and circumstances which led the President to apply the waiver.

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL WAIVER.

The President may waive the imposition of the sanction under section 2 on a person with respect to a product or service if the President certifies to the Congress that—

(1) the product or service is essential to the national security of the United States; and

(2) such person is a sole source supplier of the product or service, the product or service is not available from any alternative reliable supplier, and the need for the product or service cannot be met in a timely manner by improved manufacturing processes or technological developments.

SEC. 8. EXCEPTIONS.

The President shall not apply the sanction under section 2—

(1) in the case of procurement of defense articles or defense services—

(A) under existing contracts or subcontracts, including the exercise of options for production quantities to satisfy requirements essential to the national security of the United States;

(B) if the President determines that the person to which the sanction would be applied is a sole source supplier of the defense articles and services, that the defense articles or services are essential to the national

security of the United States, and that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available; or

(C) if the President determines that such articles or services are essential to the national security of the United States under defense coproduction agreements or NATO Programs of Cooperation;

(2) to products or services provided under contracts entered into before the date on which the President publishes his intention to impose the sanction; or

(3) to—

(A) spare parts,

(B) component parts, but not finished products, essential to United States products or production,

(C) routine services and maintenance of products, to the extent that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available, or

(D) information and technology essential to United States products or production.

SEC. 9. PETITIONS BY INTERESTED PERSONS.

(a) FILING OF PETITIONS.—Any United States person may file a petition, in accordance with regulations issued by the President, requesting that an investigation be conducted to determine whether sanctions are warranted under section 2.

(b) ACTIONS ON PETITIONS.—The President shall conduct an investigation pursuant to a petition filed under subsection (a) if, on the basis of facts set forth in the petition, the President determines that there is a reasonable basis to believe that a foreign person has engaged in any act described in paragraph (1) or (2), of section 2(a).

(c) PETITION DETERMINATIONS.—The President shall, within 20 days after receiving a petition under subsection (a), determine whether to conduct an investigation pursuant to the petition, notify the petitioner of the determination, and publish the determination in the Federal Register, together with the reasons for the determination.

(d) APPEALS.—A person filing a petition under subsection (a) may appeal a determination of the President on the petition by bringing an action for review of the determination in an appropriate United States district court. The court shall review the determination in accordance with section 706 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "non-nuclear-weapon state" means a non-nuclear-weapon state within the meaning of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, D.C., London, and Moscow on July 1, 1968;

(2) the term "nuclear materials and equipment" has the meaning given that term in section 4(4) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (22 U.S.C. 3203(4));

(3) the term "nuclear technology" means sensitive nuclear technology (as that term is defined in section 4(6) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (22 U.S.C. 3203(6))) and Restricted Data (as that term is defined in section 11 y. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(y)));

(4) the term "foreign person" means any person other than a United States person;

(5) the term "United States person" has the meaning given that term in section 16(2) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415(2));

(6) the term "person" means a natural person as well as a corporation, business association, partnership, society, trust, any other nongovernmental entity, organization,

or group, and any governmental entity, and any successor of any such entity; and

(7) the terms "otherwise engaged in the trade of" and "other engagement in the trade of" mean, with respect to a particular export or transfer, to be a freight forwarder or designated exporting agent, or a consignee or end user of the item to be exported or transferred.

SEC. 11. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

The President may issue such regulations and orders as are necessary to carry out this Act.

TRADING PARTNERS SHOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which provides for the timely and effective review of the extent to which foreign countries are complying with bilateral trade agreements with the United States. I am pleased that my colleagues, LES AU COIN, NANCY JOHNSON, and DICK SCHULZE have agreed to be original cosponsors of this legislation.

Chapter I of title III of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended in 1988, includes a provision that gives the U.S. Trade Representative discretionary authority to monitor implementation of each trade agreement entered into by the United States. Under this existing provision—section 306—if the Trade Representative exerts this discretionary authority, conducts a review, and concludes that a foreign country is not satisfactorily implementing a trade agreement, the Trade Representative is required to determine what further action will be taken under the authority granted under section 301 of the act.

Unfortunately, the current review process simply does not ensure adequate oversight of existing bilateral trade agreements. The review process needs to be opened up, so that our industries, who are directly impacted by these trade agreements, have access to the review process, have the right to petition their Government, and can call attention to wrongdoing on the part of our trading partners. The absence of effective review procedures encourages foreign countries to enter into agreements with the United States and then disregard the commitments which were made.

The legislation which I am introducing today seeks to remedy this problem by amending section 306 of the Trade Act to allow an interested party to request, at certain intervals, a review of any existing bilateral trade agreement. Under the terms of my legislation, an interested party is defined as an individual that has a significant economic interest that has been adversely affected by the failure of a foreign country to comply with the terms of a trade agreement. Upon receipt of a written request for review, the Trade Representative would have 90 days to review whether or not a foreign country was complying with the terms of the appropriate trade agreement. In conducting their review, the Trade Representative is directed to take into account a number

of factors including, among others, structural policies and tariff or nontariff barriers which may have contributed directly or indirectly to noncompliance with the terms of the trade agreement. The Trade Representative is also authorized to consult with the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture, with the U.S. International Trade Commission, and to receive public comment. Last, under this legislation, the Trade Representative will continue to have the discretionary authority to conduct reviews of existing trade agreements provided for under section 306.

These modifications will introduce a degree of accountability to our trade laws. The message is simple: if our trading partners agree to certain measures, they should be held accountable if they fail to abide by their commitments. Indeed, this proposition was clearly embodied in the section 301 process enacted by Congress in 1988. By adopting these provisions, Congress explicitly acknowledged that violations of trade agreements are unjustifiable, and are deserving of our attention. The legislation I am introducing today completes the process we formulated in 1988, so that trade agreements will have meaning, that there will be accountability and oversight in the process of implementing these very agreements.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to ensure that our trading partners do not take advantage of the United States. It does not redefine what foreign trade practices are unfair. Failure to comply with a trade agreement cannot be construed to be a fair trading practice. If we are not interested in exerting oversight of these trade agreements, perhaps we ought to think about taking away the Trade Representative's authority to enter into these agreements. We simply invite our trading partners to mouth the right words, but do nothing to require them to back up these words with specific actions. Such a trade policy does a real disservice to this country, and requires our immediate attention.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PHILLIP FLEMING, JR.

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to Phillip Fleming, Jr., accountant, business professor, husband, father, friend, and hero. Mr. Phillip Fleming was killed in the USAir SkyWest collision at Los Angeles International Airport on February 1 of this year.

Phillip Fleming will be remembered as a generous and warm family man who always did what he could to aid others. Even when his own life was on the line, he chose to give a helping, lifesaving hand to his neighbor. This time, he made the ultimate sacrifice. Survivors of the fatal crash have praised Mr. Fleming for heroically helping others escape from the wreckage even after fire had begun to spread throughout the airplane.

Born in Natchez, MS, Mr. Fleming moved to Los Angeles 22 years ago, and resided in the Baldwin Hills area of my congressional district.

He earned his MBA from the UCLA graduate school of management and went on to become the lead internal revenue auditor with the Department of Defense Logistic Agency in El Segundo, CA. Mr. Fleming worked not only as a CPA, but also served his community by laboring on behalf of small, black-owned businesses, and by teaching business at night at the Crenshaw Dorsey Community Adult School in the 28th district of California.

Mr. Fleming was actively involved in community activities. He was a member of the First AME Church, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., Delta Kappa chapter, and the Combined Federal Campaign.

Mr. Speaker, in both his professional career and personal life, Phillip Fleming enriched the lives of many Angelenos. Therefore, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in extending sincere condolences to his family: His wife Johnetta Dockins Fleming, son Omari, mother Mrs. Jessie Fleming, and his eight brothers and sisters, and a host of Phillip Fleming's colleagues and friends.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Student Financial Aid Improvement Act of 1991. This bill is comprised of noncontroversial amendments that were accepted by the Education and Labor Committee previously in 1988 during our discussions of default legislation in the 100th Congress.

The changes made by my bill are in fact the recommendations made to this committee in 1988 by the advisory committee on student financial assistance which, as you may recall, was appointed by Congress to report on recommended changes to the Student Financial Aid Program. Let me stress that these are technical amendments recommended by the advisory committee and previously accepted by the Education and Labor Committee, but were never passed into law because the default legislation we were then considering was tabled.

My Student Aid Improvement Act addresses the following problems:

First, my bill addresses the inequity of double counting of student income in the asset computation of the formula. As you know, the congressional methodology assumes that a student should be required to contribute something to cover the costs of a higher education. This is as it should be. However, congressional methodology not only takes into account what a student earns in a given year to pay for college, but also what the student has placed in a savings account. Therefore, the formula currently in use tends to double count prior year earnings that are saved for the coming school year. This creates a disincentive for students to save. My bill will correct this problem by eliminating the counting of cash on hand from the asset calculation except to the extent such cash exceeds the student contribution from discretionary income.

Second, my bill closes a loophole in the definition of independent student. This loophole as it now exists allows students to claim independence after the first 2 years of college simply because they received more than \$4,000 worth of income and student aid during those 2 years. The result of this loophole has been students claiming independent status who are otherwise dependent on the financial resources of their parents. This allows students to receive more aid than they actually need and opens the door for fraud and abuse in a program with scarce resources. My bill will ensure that only those students truly independent of their parents will be considered for higher aid awards.

Third, and most importantly, my bill will exempt the net value of a family's principal residence from the student aid eligibility formula. The reasons for this change are compelling. In my congressional district, as well as in many other metropolitan areas of the country, the booming real estate market of the past decade has made many families increasingly house rich and cash poor. Families are told that they have too much equity in their homes to qualify for Federal student financial aid, yet these same families cannot afford to carry a home equity loan. We should not hold eligibility for loans hostage to rising real estate values.

Congress has become increasingly aware of the shortcomings in the Student Loan Program. Many of my colleagues have experienced constituent complaints that they could not qualify for a student loan and will therefore not be able to attend college. It is my hope that my Student Financial Aid Improvement Act will be incorporated into the Higher Education Act this year when it comes up for reauthorization.

FULL COMMITMENT TO IMPLEMENTATION OF VOTE IN PUERTO RICO URGED

HON. JAIME B. FUSTER

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. FUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 27, the committee of jurisdiction in the other body is scheduled to mark up S. 244, which authorizes a political status plebiscite in Puerto Rico between statehood, independence, and an enhancement of the existing commonwealth status, which I favor. A similar bill, which I cosponsored, has been filed in the House again this year; as you know, the 101st Congress enacted plebiscite legislation in the House but not in the Senate.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to vigorously criticize a proposed amendment in S. 244 that the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee is scheduled to consider at its markup on Wednesday, February 27. Unfortunately, this amendment would not bind Congress to the results of a plebiscite, pledging instead only a weak sense of Congress offer merely to introduce a bill favoring the winning status choice.

Mr. Speaker, the intention all along of getting Congress involved in the plebiscite process was precisely that in so doing the House

and Senate would thus give a commitment to the people of Puerto Rico that the winning status formula would be implemented. Otherwise, the plebiscite process could degenerate into a mere popularity contest and not a real act of self-determination.

I have conveyed those very thoughts to Chairman BENNETT JOHNSTON and to all members of the Senate Energy Committee. I would like to share those thoughts with my colleagues today in both the House, where we may well be asked to debate the issue again this year, and in the Senate, where a crucial committee markup is scheduled for Wednesday. I am thus making a copy of that letter available here below:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 21, 1991.

Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: In January of 1989 when the leaders of the three political parties in Puerto Rico called upon Congress to authorize a federal political status plebiscite, they made it clear that they wanted one in which Congress would honor the results of such a referendum on self-determination between the choices of statehood, independence and an enhancement of the existing commonwealth status.

In their letter of January 17, 1989, which was addressed to the leaders in Congress, the three party presidents said that the plebiscite process should include "the guarantee that the will of the people, once expressed, shall be implemented through an act of Congress . . ." The reasons for such a guarantee are obvious: that without such assurances a plebiscite could degenerate into a mere popularity contest and not a real act of self-determination.

The intention all along of getting Congress involved in the plebiscite process was precisely that in so doing the House and Senate would thus give a commitment to the people of Puerto Rico that the winning status formula would be implemented. Puerto Rico's Legislative Assembly has all the necessary authority locally to provide for a referendum, as it did in 1967, if the purposes were merely to ascertain the people's preference and then to petition Congress for implementation of such a preference. But, precisely because Congress paid no attention to the results of the 1967 plebiscite, the leaders of the three parties in Puerto Rico decided they wanted a Congressionally authorized referendum that carried with it the commitment to honor its results.

Thus, the need for this commitment has been made clear from the very beginning and has been reiterated over and over again by the Puerto Rico leadership. Recently, the governing party in Puerto Rico, the Popular Democratic Party, meeting in Ponce, Puerto Rico, last November, passed a resolution directed to Congress which stated, among other things, that a plebiscite bill must have "adequate guarantees that the Government of the United States will implement the political status democratically selected by the people of Puerto Rico."

Moreover, Governor Rafael Hernandez Colon, testifying on January 30, 1991, before the Senate Energy Committee, emphasized that plebiscite legislation must "meet certain basic criteria," among them "a commitment from Congress to respect the will of the Puerto Rican people, and to implement whatever option is chosen in the referendum." The Governor added that "a mere pop-

ularity contest between the statuses would serve no purpose." In a letter to Senator Bennett Johnston dated February 18, 1991, the Governor again emphatically stated that any attempt at weakening the necessary Congressional commitment to implement the winning option "would seriously compromise the value of this process to Puerto Rico and the United States . . . Absent a commitment to implement the winning formula, federal legislation for a status referendum would be inconsequential and unnecessary."

This year's bill, S.244, as originally drafted by the Senate Energy Committee contained such a commitment. It states, in part, that "Enactment of this section constitutes a commitment by Congress to implement the status receiving a majority" in the plebiscite. Unfortunately, an amendment was tentatively approved at yesterday's mark-up by the Senate Energy Committee withdrawing this commitment in favor of a weak "sense of Congress" offer merely to introduce a bill favoring the winning status choice. This retreat from the original language in the bill would constitute what several Senators characterized yesterday as a "cruel hoax" on the 3.6 million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico.

If, because of the opposition to statehood, the bill has degenerated into such a sad situation, I for one would rather have no bill at all. I see no purpose in putting detailed status definitions in a referendum bill if such definitions are not at all binding. Such a bill would only mislead the people of Puerto Rico. I fully agree with Governor Hernandez Colon that without a commitment to implement the winning status formula a plebiscite would be inconsequential and unnecessary.

But I sincerely hope that you will work to reinstate the original language of commitment in S.244 as an indispensable part of the bill, a crucial element without which the bill should not be enacted.

Cordially yours,

JAIME B. FUSTER,
Member of Congress.

REESTABLISHING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN THE FLIGHT TO STABILIZE GLOBAL POPULATION

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by the gentlelady from Maryland Mrs. MORELLA and more than 80 of our colleagues, as we introduce H.R. 1110, the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991. This bill is modeled after H.R. 4075, introduced a year ago. This bill will increase funding for the international population assistance programs of the Agency for International Development to \$570 million. Out of this total, \$100 million would be administered under AID's Development Fund for Africa and \$65 million would be provided to the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA], thereby restoring U.S. funding to that agency.

Mr. Speaker, the UNFPA is the largest voluntary family planning agency in the world, with programs in some 140 countries. The United States Government terminated all assistance to the UNFPA in 1986 over groundless allegations that it supported coercive

practices within China's family planning program. Nonetheless, our legislation prohibits the use of United States population funds in China and leaves untouched the prohibition against the use of United States funds for abortion or involuntary sterilization anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, it took from the beginning of time until 1830 for the population of the Earth to reach 1 billion people. It took only 100 years, until 1930, for it to reach 2 billion. Thirty years later, in 1960, it reached 3 billion, and then it reached 4 billion in 1975. The population of the Earth has now reached 5½ billion people, and it continues to grow by 1.7 million people a week.

Although it is hard to conceive of the danger, explosive population growth is a root cause of many of our most pressing problems, like global warming, human hunger, deforestation, and soil erosion, maternal and child mortality, and increased poverty in developing nations. We do what we can to address these various problems individually, but in the absence of strong programs to deal with the threat of unbridled population growth, we are engaged in a futile attempt to douse these fires without cutting off the fuel that feeds the flames.

The problem of global warming illustrates this point. With most of the world's population growth occurring in the developing world, global emissions of carbon dioxide are expected to triple over the next 35 years, even if the developed nations stabilize their carbon dioxide emissions at current levels. In the next 20 years alone, the worldwide number of cars is expected to grow from 400 million to 700 million, mostly in the developing world, and that means increased greenhouse gas emissions even with improved technology.

Moreover, in countries like Brazil, Colombia, and Indonesia, population growth is causing global warming in a different way. In these countries, the need for more and more land is leading to devastating levels of deforestation, and it is by virtue of deforestation that these countries have become one of the highest contributors of atmospheric carbon per year. Brazil, for example, contributes approximately 336 million tons of carbon each year through deforestation, over 6 times as much as through its combustion of fossil fuels.

Common sense shows us the relationship between population growth and hunger. In Africa, the population is growing by more than 3 percent annually, while the continent's food supply increases by only 1 percent per year. Put more starkly, that means that each year more Africans will starve. It is tragic that the famines that we see on our television screens are being built into the demographic structure of the entire continent.

Dramatically increasing population demands on the environment are converting cropland to desert and destroying arable land. Wood, the continent's primary cooking fuel, is being stripped from the land faster than it is planted; 29 trees are cut down for each that is planted. Can we be so surprised that in 1900, 40 percent of Ethiopia was covered by trees and brush? Now less than 4 percent has forest cover. In Addis Ababa, the cost of firewood consumes about 20 percent of the average household income. Between 1850 and 1980,

Africa lost 60 percent of its forest cover and the pace of decertification is escalating. According to World Bank, households in Gambia and Tanzania must devote between 250 and 300 working days each year simply to finding and collecting the wood they need for fuel.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about how technology and economic growth are going to solve our problems and that population growth itself is benign. But, we have gotten too sophisticated to accept the technology panacea, even if we were to assume that those who need access to new technology the most, the people in the poorest of nations, would be able to afford it. As far as economic growth is concerned, it is per capita economic growth that matters. Per capita poverty increases when economic growth rates lag behind population growth rates, a phenomenon that has been all too common in the Central American countries of Belize, Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Honduras. Moreover, we have not yet determined the precise means of assuring the development of saving technology or of bringing about sustainable economic growth in developing nations, but we have developed tried and true methods to reduce population growth in the Third World based on the desire of women and men to limit their own fertility.

There is a way out of the population box. The fact is that half of the women in this world did not want their last child, and would choose to limit their fertility if given the means to do so. But we must act now to give women and men a choice. At the International Forum on Population in the 21st Century, held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in November 1989, over half of the world's nations, and over 80 multilateral, intergovernmental, nongovernmental, and educational institutions set forth an agenda to provide for universal voluntary access to family planning—for each and every woman and man—by the year 2000. This ambitious but essential goal will allow us to stabilize world population at a level that is still double what it is today. But unless we take ambitious steps, world population could triple by the end of the next century.

The bill that we are introducing today provides a vehicle for the restoration of U.S. leadership in the area of international family planning. It is a bill that takes seriously the global population threat to sustainable life on this Earth, and provides a means for the United States to provide its share to this effort. Finally, it is a bill that recognizes that population and associated humanitarian goals can be achieved through the realization of universal voluntary family planning services for every man and woman on this Earth.

We must accomplish these goals with all deliberate speed.

SUPPORT INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, 500 million women want and need family planning, but

lack either education, information, or the means to obtain it. Today, Congressman KOSTMAYER and I, along with 72 other original cosponsors, are introducing legislation that is aimed at ensuring that the United States does its share in helping them to control their own lives.

Many of the 42,000 infants who die daily are victims because their mothers are not allowing appropriate intervals between pregnancies. Fifteen hundred women die every day from complications of pregnancy and abortion—many of which could have been prevented by family planning.

It is imperative that the United States once again become a full and active partner with the United Nations in the vital efforts to assure couples of the basic human right to determine how many children they will have and when they will have them.

The 1991 International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act is important legislation because it significantly increases our commitment to universal access to family planning. Such a commitment is needed in order to curtail global poverty, illiteracy, environmental degradation, unemployment and civil unrest. Slowing population growth may not be a panacea for all world problems, but there can be no question that many of these problems are inexorably linked to rapid population growth.

I urge all of my colleagues who are concerned about the quality of life of future generations to vote for this bill. It is a vote that will go a long way toward determining the condition of the world that our children and grandchildren will inherit from us.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1991

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join my colleagues, Mr. KOSTMAYER and Mrs. MORELLA, as an original cosponsor of their International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991. The problem of high birth rates in lesser developed countries is the major reason so many of them are unable to break the chains of poverty. Many countries have seen increasing rates of economic growth wiped out by even faster increasing population growth. Such trends foretell of misery in the future.

It is our duty to help to educate the people of these countries on the safe and sound methods of birth control which we in the developed world have taken for granted for decades. The \$570 million that this bill would authorize for international family planning assistance is a very small price to pay to help alleviate the problem of overpopulation—the major reason why so many people go hungry in most of the world.

This bill addresses the concerns of many in regard to the crimes of forced abortions and sterilizations. It prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortion or involuntary sterilization any-

where in the world. Funding to the People's Republic of China is prohibited altogether.

It is time that the U.S. Congress take this positive and relatively inexpensive step towards alleviating misery in the lesser developed world. I urge all my colleagues to support the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991.

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ACT

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, the world's population is growing at an unprecedented rate. By 2025, it is expected to rise to between 8 and 10 billion and to reach 14½ billion by 2070. This will put a tremendous strain on the world's resources and will clearly worsen the world's over population problems.

The International Voluntary Family Planning Act will increase funding for the international population assistance programs of the Agency for International Development.

Greater international support should be given to population programs, with a goal of making family planning services universally available to every individual who wants them. Now is the time for the United States to resume its commitment to the largest voluntary family planning agency in the world—UNFPA.

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ACT

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the world's population is growing faster today than it ever has before. Every year 94 million more people inhabit our planet, and nearly 80 million of them are being born into the impoverished and already overcrowded nations of the Third World. This population growth has implications not only for the countries that must immediately accommodate the new births, however, because in the end we must all accommodate them. The economic, environmental, sociological, and political implications of this runaway growth are only too plain, and the United States can no longer afford to substitute moral sermons for the hard work of doing something to solve the problem.

The International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991 is a very promising step in the right direction. The United States must rejoin the rest of its allies around the world in helping to provide couples in the developing world with the knowledge and materials they need to plan their families. I support this essential legislation.

THE 1991 INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the 1991 International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act basically accomplishes two goals.

The first goal is to bring U.S. expenditures for population support for the developing world to a more realistic and meaningful level.

The second goal is to resume U.S. participation in the efforts of the United Nations Population Fund.

Both goals are critically important. The United States provided nearly \$290 million for overseas population activities 5 years ago. The administration is requesting only \$228 million for these activities in fiscal year 1992. This would be understandable if the problem of rapid population growth was showing signs of easing up, but that is not the case. On the contrary, the world is growing by an unprecedented 92 million people a year. The United Nations has revised its projections for the medium level at which global population will stabilize to 11 million rather than the 10 million it had projected only a year earlier. We must retrench, not retreat.

The United States must resume its contributions to the U.N. Population Fund. To do otherwise simply does not make sense. The United States cut off its contributions to UNFPA 5 years ago because it supported a national program accused of encouraging forced abortion. But UNFPA was never accused of supporting abortion anywhere—voluntary or coercive.

The best defense against abortion is voluntary family planning and the best chance for achieving universal voluntary family planning is through a resumption of the strong cooperation the U.S. Government and UNFPA have extended to one another over the years.

THE INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991.

This bill seeks both to renew U.S. support of the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] and to provide a higher level of funding for the Agency for International Development's population programs. I can think of no more effective use of our important foreign aid resources.

Mr. Speaker, the world's population is growing at an alarming rate. In 40 years it will more than double. Ninety percent of that growth will occur in the poorest nations of the world, those already swamped by a host of social, economic, and environmental ills.

Africa is the world's fastest growing continent—its current population of 662 million is

projected to double in only 24 years. In an article entitled "Uganda's Women: Children, Drudgery, and Pain" which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times, reporter Jane Perlez writes about Safuyati Kawuda, a 28-year-old woman who lives with her five children in the rural farming village of Namutumba. Her husband, who has 2 other wives and a total of 13 children, lives in the city. Ms. Perlez writes:

Mrs. Kawuda said she wanted one more child, in the hopes of its being another boy. After that, she said, she would use an injectable form of contraceptive. It is a method popular among African rural women because it can be used without their husband's knowledge. But in reality, contraception was an abstraction to Mrs. Kawuda since she had no idea where to get it. She had never heard of condoms.

We must help the Safuyati Kawudas of the world. This legislation can help do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991.

PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING EFFORTS

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the global population of today will nearly triple to 14 billion within the next 30 years unless critical steps are taken. These population increases will occur most dramatically in the poorest and hungriest countries, resulting in incredible starvation and suffering, and creating a terrible drain on the world environment.

The International Voluntary Family Planning Act of 1991 would help to provide the necessary family planning counseling and education which could help prevent these tragic consequences. Voluntary child spacing and planning for children can not only prevent human misery, but can also help to conserve the world's fossil fuels and other resources, and reduce deforestation and desertification.

This legislation is very important for many reasons. According to the World Health Organization, 500,000 women die each year during pregnancy and childbirth. Two hundred thousand of these women, almost half, could be saved if they were able to plan their families. UNICEF has reported that 14 million children under the age of 5 die each year. One-third of these children could be saved if their mothers were able to allow appropriate 2-year intervals between pregnancies.

Without adequate family planning programs, the world population will continue to grow, unabated, at a rate which will ultimately push this planet beyond sustainability. The International Family Planning Act of 1991 would provide \$570 million for population aid to the developing world to help stabilize global population and to provide a fighting chance to those women, children and families living in the poorest areas of our world.

According to the World Bank, in order for a country to stabilize the population, 72 percent

of its child-bearing couples must adopt family planning. Effective methods of planning births are now being used by 50 percent of all couples of child-bearing age, up from only 15-20 percent in the 1960's. The goal of effective family planning which stabilizes the population, permitting fundamental human needs to be met, is within our reach. However, we must help to adequately fund these efforts in order to reach this critical goal.

SUPPORT THE INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1991

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991 and I urge my colleagues who have not already cosponsored to do so. This legislation is desperately needed. The world's population is expanding at an alarming rate. In the next century we can expect that it will more than double. There is a clear link between rapid population growth, illness, poverty, resource depletion, and environmental deterioration. This grave outlook demands a renewed leadership by the United States, and that is what the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991 will provide.

About 500 million women in the developing world want and need family planning but lack access to it. They only want to exercise their right to have the number of children they want and can support. Increasing access to voluntary family planning saves lives and improves the quality of life. It is essential for those countries struggling with social, economic, and environmental problems.

The International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991 will increase United States population assistance to \$570 million and would require \$100 million of this money to be administered through AID's Development Fund for Africa. This legislation would also restore the U.S. contribution to the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] by earmarking \$65 million of this money for UNFPA. I am pleased to see money designated for both the Development Fund for Africa and UNFPA.

UNFPA is the largest multilateral organization in the world, working in 141 developing countries. It supports essential projects ranging from maternal and child health care to programs integrating family planning with parasite control to the expansion of contraceptive services and the training of nurses and doctors. UNFPA does not provide any abortion services.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. International voluntary family planning aid is essential. Our foreign assistance to developing countries is incomplete without it.

SUPPORT INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ardently support the 1991 International Voluntary Population Assistance Act, which is being introduced today by Representative KOSTMAYER. Increased funding for voluntary international family planning programs is essential if we are to avoid the grievous consequences of rapid population growth.

Many environmental and health problems facing our world can be directly related to rapid population growth. Global warming, deforestation, stress on global water supply, plant and animal species depletion, high maternal and infant mortality, and the rapid spread of disease all relate to overpopulation.

The 1991 International Voluntary Population Assistance Act is important because, in addition to authorizing an overall increase in the level of U.S. bilateral funding for voluntary family planning services around the world, this act restores the U.S. contribution to the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA]. The UNFPA is the world's largest source of multilateral voluntary family planning services.

Unfortunately, the United States ceased to fund the United Nations population efforts 5 years ago, alleging that UNFPA funds were going to support coercive abortions in China. Those allegations against UNFPA have never been substantiated. The UNFPA does not, and never has, paid for abortions or abortion-related services in any of the programs it funds anywhere, even in nations where abortion is legal. As a further safeguard, current U.S. law prohibits Federal funds from being used for abortions or related services.

Most recently, under President Bush's leadership, the administration has argued that because UNFPA assists China in developing demographic data, funding to UNFPA will continue to be denied. Once again, I find the administration's reasoning on this issue logically inconsistent and deeply flawed. On the one hand, President Bush argues strongly in favor of extending such significant benefits as most-favored-nation trading status to the Chinese Government. On the other hand, the United States continues to punish UNFPA year after year because that U.N. body has not left China, but instead carries on its mission to provide voluntary family planning and health services to the people of China. I think it unfair and unwise to single out the UNFPA for penalty when its activities and health services are so vital. And I clearly do not believe that UNFPA's collection of demographic data is a plausible reason for denying that agency our support.

The UNFPA plays a positive role in the People's Republic of China and elsewhere, creating programs that result in fewer, not more abortions. By discouraging abortions through providing high quality education in the areas of birth control methods, child spacing, and maternal and child health care, UNFPA is part of the solution, not the problem. UNFPA provides

voluntary family planning assistance to over 140 nations. Ninety of those nations have populations expected to double within the next 30 years.

It is important to note that there is no international coalition supporting the U.S. policy approach toward UNFPA. In fact, during the past 5 years, not one country has followed the example of the United States in withdrawing its contribution from UNFPA. On the contrary, many countries have increased their support.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the 1991 International Voluntary Population Assistance Act. The consequences of not addressing burgeoning population growth are simply too serious to ignore.

IN SUPPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1991

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons why this Congress should support the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991, which restores U.S. financial support for the United Nations Population Fund as well as increases funding for the Agency for International Development's population programs.

In dozens of developing countries families suffer under the burden of poverty reinforced by the relentless pressures of population growth. Recent reports have indicated that the number of human beings inhabiting our planet, currently 5.4 billion, is increasing by a quarter of a million every day. At this growth rate, the population should reach 11 billion by the end of the next century but may climb to 14 billion if population programs remain inadequate.

Many of the nations beset with exploding population growth can pinpoint the pressure of overpopulation as a significant factor in the negative social, political, economic, and environmental consequences destabilizing their countries. Perhaps potential disaster can be avoided if adequate resources are devoted to informed and effective international family planning programs. Currently, demand for family planning assistance far outstrips supply in those nations with the largest population growth rate.

The United States should be willing to join with its allies in support of the United Nations Population Fund and in increasing its attention toward our own family planning programs if we are to confront these destabilizing factors. An important segment of U.S. development efforts should be directed toward combating the pressures generated by unchecked population growth. Actions taken now can circumvent disaster in developing nations, improve the quality of life for millions, and reduce the destruction to our world's environment.

I am pleased to join today with more than 80 of my colleagues as an original cosponsor of the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991. This act further complements last year's efforts in directing U.S.

attention to the detrimental effects of explosive population growth.

**SUPPORT THE INTERNATIONAL
VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING
ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1991**

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, the 1990's are essentially "make it or break it" years for global population. With the world's population now exceeding 5 billion, we will witness at least 3 billion young people entering their reproductive years just within the next generation. Whereas virtually all of this growth is occurring in the poorest countries—those countries least able to provide even basic services for their current citizens—growing populations pose serious threats to the entire world.

For example, poverty in Central America is a cause of political unrest in the region. There are now 100 million people living on the land between the Rio Grande River, dividing Texas from Mexico, and the Isthmus of Panama. By the year 2025, there will be 225 million. Sixty-five countries which depend on subsistence farming may be unable to feed their populations by the year 2000.

Within the next decade, 10,000 species of plant and animal life will disappear annually.

Nearly 1,500 women die every day because of complications from pregnancy and abortion, many of which might not be necessary if unwanted pregnancies were avoided through family planning.

The authorization contained in the International Voluntary Family Planning Assistance Act of 1991 is a modest one. It represents a very small fraction of the money this country spends every year to pay for its own defense and for the defense of its allies. And yet the dollars we spend through this legislation to extend voluntary family planning in the developing world, and thereby to reduce the ravaging pressures of runaway population growth there, may be the most effective national security investment we make this year.

The 1980's effectively made the discussion of population control taboo. We cannot, however, continue to look away from the poverty and despair that is gripping much of the Third World. Nor can we pretend we do not see the myriad ways in which rapid population growth there conspires to entrench that poverty. The time for responsible, humane action has long since passed. This measure is an excellent way to begin the vital work of creating a different and better future for the Third World.

I commend Representatives KOSTMAYER and MORELLA for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

USE IRA'S FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which would remove a disincentive in the tax laws for limited use of IRA funds for the important task of educating the citizens of our country. This proposal would permit withdrawals on a penalty-free basis from existing IRA's for certain qualified higher education costs incurred not only by the taxpayer, but also by their spouse, parent, or grandparent. Since the IRA account balances of older taxpayers, such as parents and grandparents, tend to have a larger account balance than those of younger taxpayers, I believe that this proposal would be a meaningful form of assistance to families who are struggling to put their children through college.

Under this proposal, a taxpayer, as well as his or her spouse, parent or grandparent would be allowed to withdraw up to \$10,000 collectively to pay tuition costs, fees, books, and certain other expenses required as a result of the enrollment or attendance at eligible educational institutions. While the proposal would exempt withdrawn funds from the 10-percent penalty that is currently imposed under the income tax laws for premature withdrawals, any amounts withdrawn for these educational expenses would be considered taxable income to the IRA account holder.

There is no question this country faces a critical problem in the area educating our next generation. Many of us talk about education in terms of how it impacts our ability to compete, both domestically and internationally. During that debate, it is important to recognize that we need to rethink how this country intends to compete in the world. In the post-World War II era, we have been principally focused on competing in a political sense. That is to say, our first priority has been to ensure our ability to preserve and enhance our role as a superpower. We have dedicated a great deal of our resources to this end. What we now need to recognize is that we need to be able to compete in the global arena on an economic basis, just as we have competed, very successfully, in the political arena. It seems to me that it is critical to have a well-educated population in either case, but it is doubly important now if we are to continue to distinguish ourselves in the world marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, investing IRA funds in education is a very prudent investment. In addition, use of an IRA account to further one's education is totally consistent with the overall retirement purpose that IRA's were intended to serve. Adoption of this measure will help ease the difficulty many families face in affording higher education for their children, and I urge its serious consideration by each of my colleagues.

February 26, 1991

**MCDONNELL DOUGLAS ADOPTS
FAMILY LEAVE PROGRAM**

HON. WILLIAM L. CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to report that the McDonnell Douglas Corp., which is in my district, is implementing a family leave employee program. I would like to have this letter of congratulations inserted into the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 25, 1991.

Mr. JOHN F. McDONNELL,
Chief Operating Officer, McDonnell-Douglas
Corp., St. Louis.

DEAR MR. McDONNELL: I would like to commend the management of the McDonnell Douglas Corporation for its implementation of a new family leave employee program. This is a truly commendable and positive step for McDonnell Douglas to acknowledge the need for companies to help relieve the burden employees face when trying to balance work and family responsibilities.

As both two-income and single-parent families become more and more common, it is a responsible business practice for employers to recognize a worker's basic right to job security in times of family emergencies. By adopting family and medical leave policies, employers will create a more positive working environment with greater productivity and employee loyalty.

I commend McDonnell Douglas on its decision to adopt this family leave policy. I am especially pleased to see that this policy conforms to legislation which I am actively piloting toward enactment—The Family and Medical Leave Act.

Once again, I congratulate the McDonnell Douglas Corporation on this new program.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. CLAY,
Member of Congress.

**IN RECOGNITION OF "AMERICAN
HEART MONTH"**

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, by congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation, the month of February is American Heart Month. In an Oval Office ceremony on February 7, the President signed the 28th annual proclamation. American Heart Month presents an excellent opportunity to recognize this Nation's progress in the battle against cardiovascular diseases, including heart attack and stroke.

The research, prevention, and educational efforts of both the American Heart Association [AHA] and the National Institutes of Health [NIH], have made significant strides against cardiovascular diseases. The AHA, a nonprofit, voluntary health organization funded by private contributions, is dedicated to the reduction of disability and death from cardiovascular diseases, including heart attack and stroke. According to the AHA, from 1978 to 1988, the age-adjusted death rate from coro-

nary heart disease fell 29.2 percent and that from stroke fell 33.2 percent.

Despite this progress these diseases are still the No. 1 cause of death in the United States and worldwide. Each year, nearly 1 million Americans die from cardiovascular diseases, which claim a life every 32 seconds in the United States. In addition, the AHA reports that more than one in four Americans have some form of cardiovascular disease.

A continued matter of grave concern to me is the high mortality and incidence of stroke. Some epidemiologists believe that there is a resurgence in the number of new cases of stroke, which may be the result of more sophisticated technology detecting milder strokes and a growing older population. Provisional mortality statistics show that in 1988, 150,300 Americans died from stroke, a cardiovascular disease that affects blood vessels supplying oxygen and nutrients to the brain. Stroke, this Nation's third leading cause of death and a chief source of disability, is expected to strike about 500,000 Americans in 1991, killing over 150,000. The severity of stroke and its debilitating consequences make it one of the most expensive diseases in the United States. The AHA estimates that in 1991 stroke will cost this Nation \$15.6 billion in direct and indirect medical costs.

Moreover, black Americans are more prone to die or to be incapacitated from stroke than white Americans. Research shows that black Americans have more than a 60-percent higher risk of death and disability from stroke than whites. This disturbing figure is often attributed to blacks' higher incidence of high blood pressure, the most significant risk factor for stroke. In addition to high blood pressure, the AHA cites over controllable stroke risk factors, including heart disease, high red blood cell count, and transient ischemic attack [TIA], a temporary stroke-like event that lasts only a short time, caused by a temporarily blocked blood vessel, but can predict an actual stroke.

Also, in 1989, for the first time, the Federal Government cited a causal relationship between cigarette smoking and stroke. The Surgeon General's 1989 report, "Reducing the Health Consequences of Smoking: 25 Years of Progress," states that—

Current evidence indicates that cigarette smoking is a cause of stroke and that smoking cessation reduces the risk of stroke.

According to the most recent statistics from the Surgeon General, smoking is estimated to cause about 27,000 deaths each year due to stroke.

The National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke [NINDS], the Federal Government's focus for neurological research, is performing two studies in an attempt to clarify the disproportionate incidence and mortality rates from stroke between black and white Americans. In an attempt to explain this difference, investigators are assessing stroke risk factors, including diet, smoking, and high blood pressure.

The NINDS programs are coordinated with the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute's [NHLBI] cardiovascular stroke risk factor programs on high blood pressure and atherosclerosis. As part of its National High Blood Pressure Education Program, the NHLBI has begun an initiative focusing on 10 Southeast-

ern States and Indiana where the age-adjusted stroke death rates are more than 10 percent higher than the national average. The program consists of three areas, education, mass media campaign entitled, "Strike Out Stroke," and outreach through churches.

I congratulate the AHA, the NHLBI, and the NINDS for advances in improved diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of stroke. But much more must be accomplished to curb the incidence and mortality rate of this debilitating and often fatal disease. According to the AHA, the incidence of stroke more than doubles in each successive decade for those over 55 years of age. The AHA estimates that 72 percent of stroke victims are 65 years of age or older.

As our aging population grows, Congress must invest sufficient Federal funds in stroke research, prevention, and education. In this first year of the Decade of the Brain, I encourage my colleagues to focus on the neurosciences. The National Advisory Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke Council reports in its congressionally requested document, "Decade of the Brain: Answers Through Scientific Research," January 1989:

Our Nation stands on the threshold of enormous opportunities in the neurosciences. The foundation for future advances has been laid, and the potential exists for incalculable reductions in the human and economic tolls exacted by neurological disease and communicative disorders. The immediate and long-range benefits of research cannot be overestimated. The only question that remains is whether we as a nation have sufficient foresight and will to exploit these research opportunities.

I urge my colleagues to provide sufficient funds to reach the goal for stroke identified in the National Advisory Neurological Disorders and Stroke Council's June 1990 Implementation Plan: Decade of the Brain:

Prevention of 80 percent of all strokes and protection of the brain during the acute stroke within the Decade of the Brain.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH, 1991

(By the President of the United States of America)

A PROCLAMATION

In recent years, we have learned much about what we can do to avoid heart attack, stroke, and other forms of cardiovascular disease. For example, we know how important it is to discourage use of tobacco products, particularly among young Americans. We also know that controlling blood pressure, following a diet low in fat and cholesterol, and exercising regularly are all prudent ways of reducing the risk of cardiovascular disease.

Although significant growth has been made in the struggle to overcome cardiovascular disease, we must not become complacent. Heart attack, stroke, and other forms of cardiovascular disease continue to claim the lives of nearly 1 million Americans every year—one American approximately every 32 seconds.

Nearly 68 million Americans currently suffer from one or more forms of cardiovascular disease, including high blood pressure, coronary heart disease, rheumatic heart disease, and stroke. Contrary to widely held assumptions, heart disease does not occur primarily in old age; studies show that 5 percent of all heart attacks occur in people younger than

age 40 and more than 45 percent occur in people younger than age 65.

Women as well as men are at risk. Heart attack is the number one killer of American women, surpassing even breast cancer and lung cancer. Almost half of the more than 500,000 persons who die each year of heart attack are women.

While statistics tell us much about the prevalence of cardiovascular disease in the United States, they cannot measure the pain and suffering endured by victims and their families. Heart attack and other forms of heart and blood vessel disease also inflict a heavy toll on our Nation in terms of health care costs and lost productivity. The annual costs of related medical services and lost work due to disability total in the billions of dollars.

Since 1948, the Federal Government, through the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and the American Heart Association, a private nonprofit organization, have spent millions of dollars on educational programs and research into cardiovascular disease. The American Heart Association estimates that it has invested more than \$900 million in research since it became a national voluntary health organization in the late 1940s. That great investment has been made possible by the generosity of the American people and the dedicated efforts of more than 3 million volunteers.

During American Heart Month we recognize the importance of such ongoing efforts in the public and private sectors. We also reaffirm our commitment to overcoming cardiovascular disease.

The Congress, by Joint Resolution approved December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 843; 36 U.S.C. 169b), has requested that the President issue an annual proclamation designating February as "American Heart Month."

Now, Therefore, I, George Bush, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of February 1991 as American Heart Month. I invite the Governors of the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, officials of other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and the American people to join me in reaffirming our commitment to combating cardiovascular diseases and stroke.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventh day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fifteenth.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE PATRIOT'S SUCCESS

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, like many other residents of Massachusetts, I was pleased to have the President come to our State and extend well merited praise to the workers of Raytheon who produced the Patriot missile. The one discordant note in the President's speech was a suggestion that the excellent work which has been done on the Patriot—work which has been overwhelmingly supported in Congress with very little controversy—somehow gives support to the SDI program. The effort by some on the political right to kidnap the Patriot on behalf of SDI is

one of the boldest attempted intellectual thefts in our history. Two weeks ago, in section 4 of the New York Times, William J. Broad made clear that the Patriot program has, fortunately for our national defense, been entirely separate from the SDI program. Because this is a point which will undoubtedly figure very importantly on our debates on the military budget this year, I ask that this article be reprinted here.

THE PATRIOT'S SUCCESS: BECAUSE OF 'STAR WARS' OR IN SPITE OF IT?

(By William J. Broad)

The success of the Patriot missile in the Persian Gulf has set off a bitter war of words over whether the Strategic Defense Initiative, or Star Wars, has helped or hurt the development of anti-missile defenses. Last week the Bush Administration cited the Patriot's feats when it called for a hefty rise in financing for S.D.I. Yet some experts say the Patriots' fiery destruction of Iraqi Scud missiles in the Middle East has occurred not because of the Star Wars effort but despite it.

The argument against the helpfulness of Star Wars goes like this: The goal of an impenetrable shield, unveiled eight years ago this March by Ronald Reagan, was so utopian and unrealistic that it diverted the country's long history of anti-missile research into unnatural paths. Critics point out that the program took seven years to achieve its first interception of a mock warhead in space, the event occurring two weeks ago Monday, and that no actual arms are even close to realization. They note that the world's only working anti-missile system, the Patriot, was an Army initiative that got no financial aid whatsoever from Star Wars.

"We would have been farther along without S.D.I.," said Senator Malcolm Wallop, a Wyoming Republican who has long championed anti-missile weaponry. "The whole program was designed to study forever and build never. It hurt more than it helped."

Not so, say Star Wars backers, who argue that anti-missile development was helped significantly by the Reagan initiative, which begat the biggest program of military research in history. Some \$24 billion has been spent to date. Like any great change, supporters say, the effects are pervasive and will have practical repercussions for decades. "Future secretaries of defense are going to have to be able to deploy defenses against ballistic missiles," Defense Secretary Dick Cheney said last week in issuing the Administration's proposed military budget for the fiscal year 1992, which includes a \$1.7 billion rise to \$4.6 billion for anti-missile work. "S.D.I. is very important" for destroying not only "Scud and Scud variants," Mr. Cheney said, but against "far more sophisticated threats that we anticipate in the future."

COMPUTERS AND LASERS

The recent crusade for space-based weapons was preceded by decades of anti-missile research, most of it conducted by the Army and much of it focused on developing land-based interceptors with nuclear warheads. By the late 1970's, the Carter Administration started exploring non-nuclear ideas. Experts felt that the advent of computer chips and precision guidance promised to endow anti-missile weapons with deadly new accuracy. In 1978, the Army began an experiment to make a rocket interceptor that would destroy enemy warheads by sheer force of impact rather than by an explosive charge. So too, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency began to explore the feasibility of space-based lasers.

By early 1980, this work was so advanced that Senator Wallop and others on Capitol Hill began agitating for deployment of anti-missile lasers in space. When Mr. Reagan was elected that November, these advocates expected that the anti-missile age was about to dawn. It did not, despite the Star Wars speech of March 1983 and a vast research program.

"The resources being developed in an orderly way were diverted to the razzle-dazzle of S.D.I.," said Antonia H. Chayes, a lecturer at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard and former under secretary of the Air Force in the Carter Administration.

FRANTIC EFFORTS

Instead of taking a sober, step-by-step approach, the effort zig-zagged in a frantic search for a weapon to fulfill Mr. Reagan's dream of rendering enemy missiles "impotent and obsolete." Candidates that came and went included X-ray lasers, chemical lasers, free-electron lasers, neutral particle beams and space-based kinetic kill vehicles. "There was a lack of internal and external coherence in what we were trying to do," said a former White House official who followed anti-missile research.

Meanwhile, research on the Patriot moved steadily ahead. In June 1983, the Army decided to expand the missile's role. Not just enemy aircraft would be targeted but also short-range missiles. The Raytheon Company, maker of the Patriot, says the decision was based on intelligence estimates of Soviet missile threats, not Star Wars. "It's my judgment that it would have happened without Reagan," said Robert Stein, head of advanced defense work at the company's missile systems division in Bedford, Mass.

Angelo Codevilla, a former aide to Senator Wallop who is now a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, said one reason for the Patriot's success was that it never became entangled in the quest for an impenetrable shield. "Thank God S.D.I. never touched it," he said. "This was the only system that escaped being destroyed by Star Wars."

Backers of the Pentagon's work, while conceding some wheel-spinning, say the accomplishments of the S.D.I. program are nevertheless great. For instance, in March 1989 a three-ton, \$140 million satellite laden with advanced sensors was launched into space to see what the fiery exhausts of rockets looked like against a variety of backgrounds. The months long experiment, experts say, was vital to discovering if similar systems could track enemy missiles and warheads so space-based weapons could attack them. This March, a more ambitious sensor test is scheduled to take place aboard the space shuttle. And new ideas for anti-missile arms are speeding forward, including Brilliant Pebbles, a space-based fleet of tiny homing rockets that would smash targets by force of impact. "Patriot was faced with naysayers throughout its history, just as S.D.I. is," said Dr. Henry F. Cooper, director of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization.

Perhaps most important, supporters say, President Bush has brought the whole endeavor down to earth by recently directing S.D.I. to shift its focus to "providing protection from limited ballistic missile strikes," a clear repudiation of Mr. Reagan's more grandiose aims.

Even so, S.D.I. has such a poor reputation in Congress that some members are considering the creation of a separate agency to oversee work on short-range interceptors that would pick up where the Patriot's successes leave off. "There are people on the Hill who want to look very carefully at

whether giving this work to S.D.I. is the kiss of death," said Joseph Cirincione, an aide to the House Armed Services Committee.

THE DESERT STORM DUNE BUGGY—IT'S A HUMDINGER

HON. TIMOTHY J. ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the working men and women of the LTV Corp., in Indiana's Third Congressional District who are involved in the production of the Army's high-mobility, multipurpose wheeled vehicle—affectionately known to our troops in the Persian Gulf as the "Hummer." I recently toured the LTV plant in Mishawaka, IN, where this fine military vehicle is built, and I was moved by the dedication and skills of the work force there. The workers have a genuine sense of pride that their product is on duty and performing superbly in a number of support roles for our troops in the Persian Gulf.

Both the management of LTV and the dedicated Hoosiers working there are committed to producing a quality product that will help the U.S. military carry out its land warfare mission. As a successor to the Jeep, which supported our troops through a world war and numerous other regional conflicts, the Hummer is performing in outstanding fashion. A January 28, 1991 article in the Washington Post notes that the Hummer is passing one of the toughest tests that it can be subjected to—the desert heat of the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Post's foreign journal be printed in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1991]

THE DESERT STORM DUNE BUGGY—IT'S A HUMDINGER

(By Guy Gugliotta)

WITH U.S. FORCES, Saudi Arabia.—Camels may be the traditional "ships of the desert," but if you're more interested in scooting than cruising, U.S. armed forces recommend the "Humvee."

This curious vehicle, one part pick-up truck, one part dune buggy, is the modern-day, all-purpose, all-terrain, four-wheel-drive successor to the beloved jeep. The Humvee is one of the success stories of the U.S. deployment in Saudi Arabia, a piece of military hardware that doesn't break down, overheat, misfire or blow up and costs only \$26,707. Add-ons, like air conditioning, radio, M-60 machine gun or TOW anti-tank missile can run you a little extra.

But where a jeep was cute and cuddly, a Humvee is squat and ugly, as if Steven Spielberg had taken one of his imperial walking tanks out of "Star Wars" and chopped it off at the knees. And while jeeps ran on gas, Humvees do diesel. Jeeps had four on the floor, while Humvees have automatic transmissions, power steering and power brakes. Jeeps were easy to work on, said Air Force Senior Master Sgt. Raul Perez, "but you could flip 'em just by making a simple turn." Humvees, with the shoulders and chest of a bull mastiff, don't flip.

Perhaps the biggest advantage that the jeep had was its name, which rhymed with

beep and sounded just like what it was. When the time came to replace jeeps, the military bureaucracy, which never saw a syllable it couldn't tie into knots, created the "High-Mobility, Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle." As Casey Stengel said, "you could look it up." I did.

This was shortened to HMMWV, about as pleasant to the ear as cat claws on a blackboard. Fortunately, the American soldier soon came up with a translation palatable to human beings. Hence Humvee, or, more familiarly, "hummer."

But there is no water-cooled, V-8, 150-horsepower, 6.2-liter diesel engine on Earth that hums. The sound of a healthy Humvee could be diplomatically described as "robust."

Perez, a 41-year-old mechanic from El Paso, Texas, runs the Air Force motor pool at a large air base in eastern Saudi Arabia. Before operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, his Humvee experience was limited. Now, like the rest of the mechanics in his shop, he can identify the most common Humvee problems "just by listening to them."

"A horrible rattle means the alternator bracket is busted," Perez said. "Whining and squealing means they've blown out the steering pump."

Like many mechanics, Perez blames most Humvee problems on what he delicately describes as "operator care," but the faulty alternator brackets have been noted by Humvee mechanics throughout Saudi Arabia. Perez stopped the rattling by replacing the holding screws with metric ones "giving us a closer fit."

The steering pump has him somewhat puzzled, but he suspects that the combination of power steering, a small steering wheel and a long (130-inch) wheelbase, encourages drivers to "throw the vehicle all over the place," causing leaks to develop in the steering column. Rather than add hydraulic fluid operators continue driving until the pump runs dry and stops. "They always say, 'I don't know what happened, it just quit on me. I heard a loud bang.'"

All of this, however, is not to say the Humvee is breakdown-prone. In fact, says Perez, quite the opposite. He takes care of 75 to 100 Humvees and has only had to replace one engine and rebuild two transmissions in the five months since the U.S. deployment here began. Other mechanics are equally enthusiastic.

"Humvees are almost maintenance-free," said Army Warrant Officer Eddie Royal, 41, a battalion maintenance chief with the 82nd Airborne Division. "We run them up to 60 mph, do program maintenance on them every six months or 6,000 miles. It's a very durable vehicle."

And versatile. The basic Humvee, built by AM General, weighs 7,700 pounds with an aluminum chassis, Kevlar body and removable doors. There are 15 showroom models, including everything from "cargo-troop carrier" (canvas top, seats in back), to "armament carrier, armored winch" (Kevlar hatchback, rigged for a machine gun or grenade launcher) to "ambulance 4x4" (cross painted on the side.)

But this doesn't begin to describe the purposes to which Humvees are put. In one recent informal survey along a stretch of highway in northeastern Saudi Arabia, one observer spotted Humvees carrying radios, inner tubes, duffel bags and human beings. One Humvee was mounted with air-conditioned modules, like a camper. Another displayed a large timer for a footrace. A third

was covered with camouflage netting and had rolled-up rugs and cloth mats strapped to the top of the cab.

And besides simple transport, soldiers use Humvees as roving security vehicles, as mobile guard posts and as command communications centers. Six of them rigged with TOW missiles constitute a Marine Combined Anti-Tank, or CAT, team. Snuffling in the sand dunes like angry cockroaches, CAT Humvees can wait for an enemy tank to appear in the distance, blast it with a missile and then drive off into the desert at 45 mph. "Think of us as mechanized snipers," said TOW operator Lance Corporal Todd Hanks, 22, of Oklahoma City.

As this article notes, the Hummer gets rave reviews from those it is meant to serve—the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces. While LTV has designed a durable and dependable vehicle, there is no doubt in my mind that one reason the Hummer has done so well in fulfilling its numerous missions is the pride and care taken by the Hoosier work force that builds it. It is this Hoosier pride and dedication to quality that makes the Hummer what it is today—a reliable and safe vehicle for our troops in the field. I salute the workers of LTV in the Third Congressional District of Indiana for their pride, patriotism, and dedication to quality. Because of them, our troops are better equipped to defend democracy and freedom throughout the world.

COUNTRY LEGEND WEBB PIERCE DIES

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday a good friend of mine, a fine gentleman, and a true country music legend—Mr. Webb Pierce died in Nashville. I knew Webb Pierce for many years and I can best describe him as a very talented and truly caring person. He will be sorely missed by fans, friends, and the community.

I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in recalling some of the outstanding moments in Webb's career and in paying tribute to a man who inspired many of the great talents in the country music industry. I submit for your review the following article from the Nashville Tennessean outlining some of the milestones in Webb's career.

CANCER CLAIMS WEBB PIERCE, 69

(By Robert K. Oermann)

Country Music Hall of Fame nominee Webb Pierce, whose honky-tonk style ruled the popularity charts of the 1950s and '60s, died yesterday morning in Southern Hills Medical Center after a long battle with pancreatic cancer.

Services will be at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow at Woodlawn Funeral Home. Visitation will be at the funeral home on Thompson Lane from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 5 to 7 p.m. today. Burial will be in Woodlawn Memorial Park.

One of the biggest country hit-makers of all time, Pierce 69, was noted for his penetrating vocal delivery, songs of barroom romance, flashy rhinestone stage costumes, business acumen, durable career and independent character.

Mr. Pierce had been hospitalized several times at Southern Hills following abdominal surgery last March. The cause of death was listed as congestive heart failure, brought on by his illness.

To the millions who bought his music, Webb Pierce was the consummate country stylist. Even a partial list of his 97 hit records suggests the large number of classic songs he introduced—"There Stands the Glass, Wondering, Missing You, Back Street Affair, I Ain't Never, Tupelo County Jail."

To many, Webb Pierce was the image of a Nashville superstar, right down to his silver-dollar-studded car and guitar-shaped swimming pool.

With 50 Top 10 hits, he ranks as one of the 10 biggest stars in country music history.

Mr. Pierce's "Slowly" recorded in 1954, was the first country hit to feature the now-standard pedal steel guitar.

With "In the Jailhouse Now" in 1955 and "Any Old Time" in 1956, he kept alive the memory of country music immortal Jimmie Rodgers.

In turn, today's country stars have saluted Mr. Pierce's influence.

His 1955 No. 1 hit "I Don't Care" was introduced to a new generation of country music lovers by Ricky Skaggs in 1982, the same year that Loretta Lynn re-recorded "There Stands the Glass. "No Love Have I", which Mr. Pierce introduced in 1959, was revived by Gail Davies in 1978.

Willie Nelson reacquainted his followers with the distinctive Pierce style by recording a duet LP with the honky-tonk master in 1982. Pierce also recorded duets with the late Red Sovine, Mel Tillis and Kitty Wells.

A remarkable number of stars sprang from Pierce's band, the Wandering Boys. In addition to Sovine, the group was the training ground for pianist Floyd Cramer, steel guitarist Jimmy Day, the harmony team the Wilburn Brothers and singers Goldie Hill and Faron Young.

The list of careers he boosted is a long one. He got the Wilburns their recording contract with Decca. He brought Tillis and Roy Drusky to Nashville as songwriters. He got Merle Kilgore his first recording contract.

Mr. Pierce was one of the most successful stars in the history of the Billboard magazine country charts, and according to the magazine's statistics he reigned as the most popular country act of the 1950s.

Webb Pierce was born Aug. 8, 1921, on a farm near West Monroe, La. He began playing guitar as a teen-ager, gaining local renown on Monroe's KMLB radio in the early 1940s.

In 1944 he moved Shreveport in search of bigger fame. Mr. Pierce took a job at Sear's in the menswear department while persistently angling for a slot in the cast of the popular Louisiana Hayride barn dance show on KWKH. He joined the show in 1949.

In 1951 he was signed to a Decca Records contract, striking pay dirt with the label in January 1952 with Wondering, followed by That Heart Belongs to Me and Back Street Affair, all three of which were No. 1 hits.

When Hank Williams was fired from the Grand Ole Opry in 1952, Mr. Pierce was recruited as his replacement. He moved to Nashville with his new bride, the former Audrey Grisham.

By 1953 he was topping magazine polls as the nation's favorite country singer.

Hits such as Why Baby Why (a duet with Sovine), It's Been So Long, I'm Walking the Dog, Even Tho, I'll Go on Alone and More and More led to more than 30 top show business awards of the day and a baronial home

on Curtiswood Lane near the governor's mansion by 1956.

Along with Carl Smith, Ray Price, Faron Young and the late Lefty Frizzell and Hank Williams, Mr. Pierce virtually defined the honky-tonk style of the early 1950s. When people today talk about the "traditional" country sound, they are referring to the style he helped popularize.

He quit the Opry in 1955 to become one of country music's early television stars as a regular on the ABC network series *Ozark Jubilee*. He rejoined the Opry cast in 1956, but left again in 1957.

In addition to radio, records and TV, he made his mark in such hillbilly films of the 1950s and 1960s as *Buffalo Gun*, *Road to Nashville* and *Music City USA*.

He was also instrumental in the establishment of Nashville as a music business center. He and the late Jim Denny co-founded Cedarwood Publishing in 1953. He was preceded only by Roy Acuff as a country star with a song business, and Cedarwood was the first firm to build an office building on Music Row.

Mr. Pierce also invested in radio stations and real estate.

His \$100,000 Pontiac convertible embellished with silver dollars, cattle horns, six-shooters and tooled leather was a familiar sight to country fans of the 1960s. He donated it to the Car Collectors Hall of Fame museum in 1983.

In the 1970s, Mr. Pierce had a highly publicized legal battle with his Oak Hill neighbors, notably Ray Stevens, about attracting tourists to his house with his guitar-shaped swimming pool. He built a second such pool as a attraction on Music Row in 1978.

Always an opinionated, flamboyant character, Mr. Pierce frequently went against the grain in Music City. Although popular with disc jockeys and fans, he was never part of the Music Row establishment.

He spent the late 1970s on the Plantation Records label, but apart from the Nelson duet LP did not have notable recordings in the 1980s.

In October 1989, Webb Pierce was given the Master Achievement Award during Country Music Week ceremonies staged by the Reunion of Professional Entertainers organization.

Last October, Mr. Pierce was nominated for the Country Music Hall of Fame, and his election is expected.

During his later career he was tirelessly championed by his former band member Max Powell, who was his aide, spokesman and friend to the end.

Survivors in addition to his wife, Audrey, include his daughter, Debbie, and son, Webb Jr., both of Nashville; a half-brother, James Wyatt, Monroe, La., and two grandchildren.

IGNORING BRIDGE MAINTENANCE NEEDS COULD LEAD TO DISASTER

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting a column by Sidney Schanberg which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on February 14 concerning the folly of ignoring the Nation's bridges.

Mr. Schanberg notes how a small amount of maintenance funding each year could have

prevented New York City from now facing major capital costs and unsafe spans which carry thousands daily.

For more than a decade, our entire Nation has been following the same penny-wise, pound-foolish policy that Mr. Schanberg describes in New York. Nationwide, it is estimated that 41 percent of all bridges are functionally obsolete or structurally deficient.

Mr. Schanberg predicts that a major disaster will be needed to focus attention on the bridges, such as a subway train falling into the East River. With a \$16 billion surplus in the highway trust, we have ample funds to begin a national bridge improvement effort.

Let's not wait for the disaster to happen. It might not be in New York City—it might be in any one of our communities.

A BRIDGE TOO COSTLY—IT WILL TAKE A "DISASTER MOVIE" TO GET THE CITY'S SPANS REPAIRED

NEW YORK—In the life-goes-on category, it's comforting to read that New York City's bridges are still falling down. This is the kind of thing we need to get our minds off the war.

In the war, people are actually being blown apart, even though you can't get any pictures of this on your television set. With the bridges, someone usually shuts them down just before a subway train would have broken through the rotted steel and fallen into the East River. So the bridges just go on falling apart, but not quite snapping in two, and this provides the reassuring kind of constant that New Yorkers need in their lives to steady them.

It also provides useful conversation filler when there's a draggy spot during the war on television (like when the unemployed military experts come on)—"Didya see pieces are falling off the Manhattan Bridge?" "Yeah, just like the Williamsburg a couple of years ago." "It just keeps getting worse. Nobody ever does anything about it." "Yup. Never changes. One of these days, the N train is going right in the water."

It would indeed take a train diving into those inky depths to get the money produced to fix the bridges. I obviously don't wish this, but nothing else seems to seize the attention of those in charge.

Government is sometimes too serious a matter to be turned over to the politicians. They'll do almost anything to duck a tough issue. Tough issues are those that can cost you votes.

Right now, there's a bridge donnybrook going on between the newly courageous City Council and the mayor, David Dinkins—who looks more and more each day like a man who wishes everything would go away.

This fight isn't really about how to pay for keeping up the bridges. That's one of those tough issues. No, the spitting match is over whether the mayor and his transportation commissioner, Lucius Riccio, ignored clear warnings from lower officials that the Manhattan Bridge was falling apart.

The warnings came in memos from officials lower down, and of course they were ignored because the mayor, et al., would have to offend voters to raise the money, and he has no more stomach for that tough decision than did the previous mayor and the one before him, ad vacuum. And the same goes for the City Council.

Here's the weepy political explanation: Bridges don't have constituencies like police and school budgets, they're not sexy items, everybody wants to complain about them

but no one wants to pay for them, so what can we do?

And here's how the planners and engineers explain it: If you spend a relatively small amount of money now for ongoing maintenance, you'll literally save the billions that will be needed later to rebuild the structures you allowed to fall apart for lack of periodic paint jobs, minor repairs and upkeep.

Consider the Williamsburg Bridge. It got to the scare stage in 1988. Before that, it was only dangerous—steel beams would fall occasionally into the East River. Which means that by 1988 it was one of those disaster movies waiting to happen. The then-mayor said it was everybody's fault but his, especially all the lousy mayors who preceded him. But in the end, because they were at the scare stage, regardless of how they had gotten there, the bridge had to be fixed. The price tag? \$400 million. Just to get it into acceptable shape.

Samuel Schwartz, who was in charge of bridges for the Transportation Department at the time and was trying to turn things around, wrote about it later in these simply and cogent sentences:

"The 87-year-old Williamsburg Bridge will cost approximately \$400 million to reconstruct. Leading civil engineering experts, commissioned by the city, found that for \$2 million annual (1990 dollars) the bridge could have been properly maintained and its steel would have lasted 200 years. In 87 years we should have spent \$174 million on maintenance (we probably spent closer to \$20 million). Instead we will spend the \$400 million this decade for a net waste of \$200-plus million."

"When we looked at all 840 city bridges, we found that a well-run program should cost \$150 million a year. But we will spend \$400 million a year for the next 10 years because we have not maintained the bridges. That's \$2.5 billion wasted!"

In reality, the waste will probably be much greater. That's because Schwartz wrote those words a year ago, and now, with the recession and the resultant drop in city tax revenue, the bridge budget is being slashed significantly. This means maintenance will be deferred, the bridges will get a little scarier and the rebuilding costs will rise accordingly. Look for a lot more bridge closings in the next year or two. It's either that or the disaster movie.

There are ways to raise the money to do the job now, but these would take tough decisions. Like putting tolls on the East River bridges. This would not only produce money, but it might also persuade some people to form car pools and thus ease the gridlock in Manhattan and save gasoline at the same time.

But don't hold your breath. The last major political decision about the East River bridges was made in the early 1900s. That was Mayor William Gaynor's decision to take the tolls off the East River bridges. He did it to get re-elected—and he was.

Isn't it reassuring? Nothing really does change.

SATELLITE COMPETITION

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, there is much to be said about the American entre-

preneurial spirit—the ability to take chances, to endure and to succeed. This spirit is as alive today as it was more than a century ago when America's industrial magnates evolved. As we approach the 21st century with the advent of new technologies a new generation of American business success stories is unfolding.

I would like to call your attention to one such modern day business success story. Just a few short years ago Rene V. Anselmo founded Pan American Satellite of Stamford, CT. Two years ago, Mr. Anselmo risked \$85 million by launching a communications satellite. Today, Mr. Anselmo is ringing up millions of dollars in sales in satellite time to television networks around the world.

I urge my colleagues to read an outstanding account of this modern day success story as described so eloquently by reporter Edmund L. Andrews in the February 10, 1991, edition of the New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1991]

NEW COMPETITION IN THE SKY, AND JUST IN TIME FOR THE WAR

(By Edmund L. Andrews)

Military contractors have not been the only companies to get a lift from the United States-led war against Iraq. The nearly insatiable demand for live television reports about the war has been a bonanza for companies providing satellite services.

But few operators have enjoyed the sweet vindication of Rene V. Anselmo, the founder of Pan American Satellite of Stamford, Conn. Two years ago, in what seemed like a good way to lose a fortune, Mr. Anselmo gambled \$85 million for the sale of his former broadcasting businesses to buy and launch the first privately owned communications satellite over the Atlantic Ocean.

At the time, he faced heated opposition from regulators, had no assured customers and enough insurance to recover only half his loss if his satellite blew up during launch. And he was lunging into a market controlled by Intelsat, a satellite consortium owned by organization in 119 nations.

But today, Mr. Anselmo is virtually booked solid, offering cut-rate prices and fast bookings for television networks around the world. With 1991 sales likely to climb well beyond the company's initial projection of \$25 million, he is now busy raising money for three more satellites.

To be sure, boom times have come to almost everybody in the satellite business since the war began. Intelsat has seen "spot" bookings for satellite time—those not reserved far in advance—surge to 400 programs a day, up from about 150. Bright Star Communications Ltd., based in London, which buys satellite time in large volume from Intelsat and then resells it, has roughly doubled its business. Even American companies like GTE Spacenet are busy, relaying signals from abroad to local stations across the United States.

While Pan American's satellite does not reach the Persian Gulf, it, too, has benefited from the war. Revenues from spot bookings surged to about \$2 million for the last three weeks of January, up from \$200,000 a month before the war, although business has dropped slightly as stations have trimmed back war coverage. There are also revenues from long-term leases with television networks on both sides of the Atlantic.

"It was busy before, but it's pandemonium now," said Mr. Anselmo.

The company's satellite has become a key link for European news organizations that broadcast live from Washington, like the British Broadcasting Corporation or SAT 1, the German network. It is also used heavily by American networks like CBS and ABC to transmit programming abroad and to supplement their direct satellite links to the Midwest by sending material through Europe.

The company's arrival has not brought prices down but has helped to improve service. "Pan Am Sat has been very good for the industry," said Charles E. Hoff, managing director for Cable News Network's satellite news gathering operations. "They offer a non-Intelsat alternative, essentially a free-market availability, and that has been good for all of us."

One of Pan American's first customers, CNN, has used its satellite mainly to send programming abroad but also to get material from overseas bureaus.

For Mr. Anselmo, who is 65 years old, Pan American is the second major project of his career. Born in Medford, Mass., he spent 11 years after college in Mexico, working for the Mexican television network, Televisa, and as an independent producer. In 1961, he came to the United States and, with other investors, bought a bankrupt UHF station and subsequently started up 14 others, all broadcasting in Spanish. That led to the founding of the Spanish International Network, financed in part by Televisa and offering Spanish-language programming to stations and cable systems in the United States and Latin America.

But Mr. Anselmo ran afoul of the Federal Communications Commission, which prohibits foreign control of television stations and contended that his were under foreign control because of Televisa's stake in SIN. After years of litigation, Mr. Anselmo sold his stations and separated himself from SIN in 1986. It was the \$100 million from the sales that enabled him to buy and launch the satellite.

His timing turned out to be excellent. Mr. Anselmo bought a satellite from RCA and was able to take advantage of special incentives offered by Arianespace, the European rocket company, to launch the satellite for only \$9 million. Arianespace was having trouble getting customers for a new launch rocket in part because of an explosion of an earlier rocket.

As a result, Mr. Anselmo was able to become operational for about \$85 million. Buying and launching a comparable satellite today would cost \$180 million to \$200 million.

The satellite became operational just before the breakdown of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the fall of the Berlin wall generated a surge in demand for satellite capacity. "They were in the right place at the right time," remarked Timothy Logue, space and telecommunications analyst with the Washington law firm of Reid & Priest. "News organizations have an insatiable drive to beat their opponents, and they will turn to whatever means are available."

The start-up of Pan American would have come off without a hitch if not for regulatory barriers.

Under longstanding international agreements, the Intelsat consortium had until Pan American's arrival enjoyed a virtual monopoly over international satellite communications. Under the system, participating countries designate companies—usually government-owned telephone companies—that serve as their representative to Intelsat. These companies transmit and receive material from Intelsat satellites and

charge their customers, who supply telephone, data and television services. In the United States, access to Intelsat is controlled by the Communications Satellite Corporation, a for-profit company.

In part because regulators feared that a competitor would undermine Intelsat, and in part because Pan American would inevitably deprive governments of Intelsat fees, Mr. Anselmo's plan to offer a competitive service generated heated opposition.

Although the Reagan Administration in 1983 endorsed the idea of limited competition with Intelsat, it took Mr. Anselmo from 1984 to September 1987 to get final launch approval from the Federal Communications Commission. Even then, he didn't have a viable business because only one other country, Peru, had agreed to allow people within its borders to communicate over the new satellite.

With patience, persistence and pressure from major communications users, Mr. Anselmo began receiving "landing rights" for his satellite from other countries. By the time of the launch in 1988, he had agreements with a half-dozen countries, including West Germany. Almost 70 countries have since opened up to the new satellite.

Today, Pan American, whose communications base in Florida houses 10 earth stations, is booked almost to capacity. Pricing is complicated, but the rates appear to be somewhat cheaper than the competition's. The company says prices vary from less than \$1,000 for an hour of satellite time to \$2,400, depending on the customer's annual usage. It says most customers pay less than \$1,300. That does not include the charge for using transmission stations on the ground, which can add a few hundred dollars at each end.

By contrast, Bright Star Communications, which resells time with Intelsat, charges \$1,700 to \$2,250 an hour, including earth station fees. Comsat, the American Intelsat representative, charges a flat rate of \$2,637 an hour, which includes earth station fees.

Mr. Anselmo said he never conducted formal market research to predict where customers would come from. The whole gamble was based on instinct. "My theory," he said, "was that I couldn't imagine putting a satellite up there and offering all this technology without it being used."

A CORRECTION: COMMONWEALTH STATUS BEST FOR PUERTO RICO

HON. JAIME B. FUSTER

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. FUSTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a serious error in my comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22, headlined, "Columnist Tom Wicker criticizes statehood for Puerto Rico," page E577. In the version which I submitted for publication, I wrote, in part: "I have great respect for the institution of statehood, Mr. Speaker, but I am convinced that the existing Commonwealth status option in such a plebiscite is in the best interests of both Puerto Rico and the United States."

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, my comments as printed in the RECORD erroneously added the word "not," asserting that I "am convinced that the existing Commonwealth status option in such a plebiscite is not in the best interests of Puerto Rico and the United States." Clearly,

the wrong impression has been conveyed here. Clearly, as all my colleagues know, I strongly support and have always supported the enhanced Commonwealth option: it is the one status choice for Puerto Rico that has worked and worked well ever since Congress created it in 1952.

Because it is necessary that my colleagues read this correction in the context of my original comments of February 22, I am repeating the full text of those comments:

COLUMNIST TOM WICKER CRITICIZES STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

Mr. FUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the House and the Senate move toward resolution of legislation providing for a political status plebiscite in Puerto Rico, I think it incumbent that my colleagues really think through the statehood option. I have great respect for the institution of statehood, Mr. Speaker, but I am convinced that the existing Commonwealth status option in such a plebiscite is in the best interests of both Puerto Rico and the United States.

More and more, Mr. Speaker, other voices seem to share that point of view, and these voices range across the political spectrum: Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative. Surprisingly, they come from such disparate voices as the conservative syndicated columnists James Kilpatrick and Patrick Buchanan and the liberal columnist Tom Wicker of the New York Times. Even though I, a Democrat, seldom share the views of Mr. Kilpatrick and Mr. Buchanan, I inserted their columns in the RECORD last year in which they questioned granting statehood to Puerto Rico.

Now comes Tom Wicker, the celebrated columnist of the New York Times, and I think his observations of February 9, 1991, make good food for thought as my colleagues in the 102d Congress ponder anew, legislation in the House and the Senate that would authorize a three-way political status plebiscite in Puerto Rico.

THE 51ST STATE?
(By Tom Wicker)

"I want Puerto Rico to become the 51st state," President Bush has said. Does he realize that would mean fewer Puerto Ricans in private-sector jobs, more on welfare, and a probable additional cost of \$17 billion to the U.S. Treasury?

Attorney General Dick Thornburgh told Congress this week that the Administration favors a plebiscite in which Puerto Ricans might well vote for statehood. Senator Bennett Johnston of Louisiana, the chairman of the committee preparing plebiscite legislation, says Puerto Ricans' choice in that vote would be "morally binding" on Congress.

Mr. Thornburgh questioned the constitutionality of the only other likely status alternative—an improved, virtually autonomous version of the present Puerto Rican "commonwealth." A third option, independence, is not believed to have sufficient support to be a real possibility for the island.

Mr. Bush's desire for statehood is hard to understand, although the island's Republican Party also favors it. From a narrowly partisan point of view, Puerto Rico as a state would rate two senators and five or six members of the House. That's larger than a number of present delegations, including some that usually vote Republican; and the Puerto Rican delegation might well be all or mostly Democratic.

From a broader perspective, moreover, the island insists on maintaining its Spanish culture, which would make it the only state with Spanish as its official language. Even Puerto Rican Republicans agree on that—though mainland Republicans hardly can be enthusiastic about such an exception.

Economically, statehood would be a disaster for the island. It would mean the loss of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico's exemption from U.S. taxes, under Section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code. No state is entitled to claim such an exemption, which has been applicable to Puerto Rico since before commonwealth status was achieved in 1952. That's one good reason the island's annual per capita income has risen since then from a few hundred dollars to more than \$6,000 a year.

Not only would statehood bring the Federal income tax to Puerto Rico; a Peat Marwick study estimated that 72 percent of the companies that have put about 2,000 industrial plants on the island, because of its tax advantages, might leave once statehood caused the loss of those advantages. That would mean the flight of 80,000 to 145,000 jobs, the study suggested.

A Congressional Budget Office report similarly found that if Puerto Rico's commonwealth tax advantages were lost, unemployment—averaging 14.6 percent even now—would increase by 100,000 within the decade. Under statehood, Puerto Rican gross product would fall by 10 to 15 percent in the same period.

Under the prevailing commonwealth status, however, economic growth is projected at a real annual rate of 2.5 to 4 percent. That's important to other Americans because Puerto Rico already buys more mainland goods than Brazil, Chile, Argentina and Columbia combined—\$9.4 billion in 1989.

Why would Puerto Ricans opt for statehood if it meant they had to pay United States income taxes while their economy was shattered? One reason is that many islanders are too poor to pay income tax, and statehood would make many eligible for nearly double welfare benefits—causing an estimated \$17 billion rise in Federal outlays for Puerto Rico, a short-term bonanza.

Statehood would allow the islanders to participate in Presidential elections, and to send a voting delegation to Congress. Many Puerto Ricans seem also to believe that it would magically produce for them a living standard equal to that of mainland Americans, whose per capita income is far higher—even in Mississippi, the poorest of the current states.

Commonwealth supporters, like Gov. Rafael Hernández Colón, believe they can win a plebiscite, though polls now give statehood a narrow lead. They hope commonwealth status can be so defined in the Senate's plebiscite legislation that, if voters opt for it, Congress could not change it in the future. But Mr. Thornburgh said the Constitution required United States territories, other than states, to be controlled by Congress; therefore, he argued, Congress could take away commonwealth status any time it chose.

If sustained by Bennett Johnston's committee, that's a telling argument against commonwealth and for statehood—and one that raises the question whether President Bush grasps the real consequences of what he says he wants for Puerto Rico.

MARTIN FINE HONORED FOR OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Marty Fine does not hold any public office, but he is truly one of Miami's finest public servants. For almost four decades, he has devoted his considerable energy and talent to improving the lives of those in our community who are most vulnerable and least able to help themselves. In many ways, Martin Fine has been the conscience of our community.

For his efforts, Martin Fine has been awarded the Miami Chamber of Commerce's highest award for community service. I would like to reprint the following article from the Miami Herald which provides further information about the award and the accomplishments of this remarkable man.

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 31, 1991]

ADVOCATE OF POOR TO GET CHAMBER'S TOP HONOR

(By Andres Viglucci)

Martin Fine, the prosperous lawyer who has made a parallel career out of championing education and housing for the poor, will receive the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce's highest award today for his service to the community.

Fine, 63, is winner of the 10th Sand in My Shoes Award, given to people who have embraced South Florida and worked to make it a better place.

"Marty is honestly the most dedicated, committed and devoted civic leader I have ever met," said chamber President Bill Collum. "The guy is just really incredible. I can't think of a person who deserves it more than he does."

Fine will pick up the award—a pair of bronze shoes—during a luncheon at the Inter-Continental Hotel in downtown Miami.

His community service resume would fill pages. Fine is in his second year as chairman of the board of trustees of Miami-Dade Community College. He is a member of the board and former chairman of the chamber of commerce, and a stalwart on the New World Center Action Committee, which redrew the map of downtown Miami.

But some of his most effective work has come behind the scenes, without title or committee: Along with state Sen. Carrie Meek, he was the chief architect of a real-estate tax fund that has generated millions of dollars for the construction of affordable housing in Dade County. The innovative program has been hailed across the country.

He also masterminded the push to extend the term of Miami's mayor from two years to four.

Fine says one thread runs through all his seemingly disparate endeavors: a concern for the quality of life of the poor and working poor.

"It's a rare opportunity, and a treat for me, to combine work in education with housing for poor people," Fine said. "Those are two bedrock areas in helping people climb out of the mire of poverty and hopelessness."

Fine, today a senior partner in the firm of Fine Jacobson Schwartz Nash Block and England, has been here 44 years, since attending law school at the University of Miami upon his discharge from the Army.

He vows to stay "until they take me out." His civic involvement in a prominent role began in 1955, when he joined the Miami Housing Authority. He stayed 10 years, eight of them as chairman, until the authority was absorbed by Metro-Dade County. A public housing project for the elderly and disabled near the Orange Bowl bears his name.

He was also a member of a group of developers who built Park Tower, a federally subsidized apartment building in downtown Miami for moderate-income people.

The building surfaced in the news two years ago, when federal auditors found that Fine had paid a lobbyist \$225,000 to help obtain federal money to renovate the apartments. After finding that hiring such lobbyists was common practice among local developers, federal officials revamped the housing program. Fine was never accused of doing anything improper.

Not all of Fine's causes have succeeded. A firm believer that government and private citizens must spend money to help the poor, he has vocally supported some tax plans that haven't proven popular with the general public—such as tax for children's services that voters defeated in 1988.

But he's not sorry he did. "I think that it's impossible to help poor people with mirrors and rhetoric," Fine said. "I think when programs are properly explained, when people understand what's at stake, that by and large the community has been responsive."

INTRODUCTION OF NURSING HOME ACCESS TO RESPIRATORY THERAPY ACT

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I am once again introducing legislation to improve the health care of our nation's elderly by preserving respiratory therapy services at nursing homes.

As costs of health care in this country continue to spiral out of control, we must find low cost ways of fine-tuning the Medicare system to improve access to health care for the Nation's elderly. My bill, The Nursing Home Access to Respiratory Therapy Act, is one example of such cost effective fine-tuning. By making only a minor technical change in Medicare, one consistent with current practice, my bill would assist elderly Americans in need of respiratory care; especially those living in medically underserved areas such as inner cities and rural communities.

Many of our senior citizens suffer from both chronic and severe respiratory illnesses such as emphysema and asthma. Increasingly, these senior citizens are dependent upon mechanical ventilators in order to breathe for some part of the day. Years ago these patients would have remained confined to the hospital. Today, however, the advance of medical technology and the advent of the Medicare prospective payment system has had the effect of transferring many of these respiratory patients out of the hospital and into alternative care sites such as skilled nursing facilities [SNF's].

Over the past 10 years, respiratory care in SNFs has been delivered by a variety of entities, including the transferring hospital, independent respiratory care companies, or by the nursing home. The system has worked well until recently, when Medicare in certain States has begun to enforce an outmoded and little-known provision which requires that only a hospital with a transfer agreement with a SNF may provide respiratory care personnel to the SNF. Furthermore, only full time employees of that hospital are eligible to be sent to the nursing home. This provision was enacted in 1965 when respiratory care services were almost always limited to the hospital and are clearly out of step with today's needs.

Medicare, until recently, has not enforced this rule. However, Medicare intermediaries in Ohio, Florida, and New Jersey have now revived it, and the consequences for SNF patients could be devastating, particularly in rural areas and inner cities.

Many rural hospitals are experiencing severe manpower shortages, and must rely on temporary agencies or contract service employees. Regardless of the qualifications of the respiratory personnel, these individuals may not provide reimbursable respiratory care simply because they are not full-time hospital employees. Yet most small hospitals cannot afford a fully operational respiratory care department and must rely on contract personnel to deliver care to the respiratory patients. Without this technical correction, care to SNF patients would once again be prohibited.

There are currently 6,000 vacancies for respiratory therapists in the country. The Institute of Medicine has predicted that by the year 2000 the demand for respiratory therapists will exceed the supply by 34 percent. The resurrection of this rule by Medicare would further limit respiratory care at SNF's which is already suffering from personnel shortages.

The legislation I am introducing today would rectify this problem by including respiratory therapy as part of allowable extended care services in a skilled nursing facility. Since the legislation simply codifies the previously existing method, which is still acceptable in almost every State, of providing respiratory care services through a variety of practitioners, it is expected to have little or no budget impact. It simply allows patients afflicted with respiratory illnesses to continue to receive the needed and appropriate respiratory care, regardless of the care site.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Representatives BACCHUS, BOUCHER, BOXER, COLLINS (IL), DEFazio, DELLUMS, DICKS, DIXON, DWYER, EMERSON, ENGLISH, EVANS, FAZIO, FOGLIETTA, GEJDENSON, GILMAN, HERTEL, HORTON, HUGHES, HYDE, JEFFERSON, JOHNSON (SD), KAPTUR, KOLTER, LAGOMARSINO, LANCASTER, LEWIS (FL), LIPINSKI, LLOYD, MFUME, MORELLA, MURTHA, OBERSTAR, PEASE, PELOSI, PENNY, POSHARD, RANGEL, REGULA, ROE, SERRANO, SMITH (NJ), SMITH (FL), SNOWE, TOWNS, WALSH, WISE, and WYDEN have joined me as original cosponsors of this legislation to improve the quality and increase the access to respiratory care services available to our Nation's elderly. I am hopeful that this legislation will be enacted quickly so that the negative consequences of the enforcement of the outdated Medicare provision will be avoided. I

urge other colleagues to join me in this important effort.

NATIONAL PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES ACT OF 1991

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today Senator BOB GRAHAM and I are introducing the National Presidential Debates Act of 1991. This legislation, which was first introduced in the 101st Congress, requires candidates for the Presidency who qualify for public campaign finance funds during the general election period to participate in four debates in order to receive those funds.

Congress will again this year consider the question of campaign finance reform, and passage of a comprehensive reform package should be a top priority for Members on both sides of the aisle. We will undoubtedly study a broad range of topics as part of this debate, from the merit of political action committees to the responsibilities of broadcasters to the role of public financing.

A chief focus—and a primary goal—of this debate should be the restoration of public confidence in political campaigns. The public's growing cynicism—or at best indifference—to political campaigns is the result of a steady decrease in the substantive information available to the public.

Following a 2-year study, the Markle Commission on the Media and the Electorate last year cited citizen abdication of their role in the electoral process as its single most disturbing finding, noting that its research had found that, "American voters do not seem to understand their rightful place in the operation of American democracy," and see themselves as "distant outsiders with little personal consequence at stake in national elections."

Blame for this trend can be spread far and wide, from the networks to the parties to the candidates themselves. As a consequence of campaigns driven largely by photo opportunities and sound bites, substantive debates between the candidates have grown in their value to the voter. Nowhere is this more true than in Presidential campaigns, and polls have consistently reflected the importance of televised debates to voter decisionmaking.

On average, nearly 50 percent of American households with televisions tune in to Presidential debates. Debates represent one of the few instances in a campaign when voters are able to hear from the candidates themselves, in their own words, rather than through the thicket of speech writers, spin doctors, and journalists that too often shape public perceptions of the candidates. Viewers know that regardless of how well coached or prepped a candidate may be prior to taking the stage, he or she is alone, unfiltered, and eye-to-eye with the voter once the debate begins. And that's the way voters like to judge candidates.

Such debates have deservedly become an integral part of electing our President. The anticipation of nationally televised face-to-face meetings between candidates is a galvanizing

force in the electoral process. The debates focus public attention, heighten voter interest, and require the candidates to prepare for and stand up to close scrutiny. This is an important part of our democratic process.

Although debates have occurred in the last four Presidential campaigns, over a decade passed from 1964 to 1976 without a single debate between major party candidates. Even so, debates since 1976 have been no sure thing. In 1980, debates were threatened by President Carter's Rose Garden strategy and the participation of an independent candidate. In 1984, debates only occurred at the insistence of President Reagan, whose advisers recommended that he participate in none. And in 1988, during negotiations on the debates, President Bush's advisers, Jim Baker and Roger Ailes, reluctantly agreed to two debates after at first arguing that none were needed.

Once again, as the 1992 campaign approaches, there is no guarantee that the Democratic and Republican nominees will debate. And even if they do, it will be the result not of a commitment to a substantive campaign, but rather the product of bitter political haggling.

The public, which pays for the campaigns of Presidential candidates, deserves and should demand substantive debates in return for its investment. In a symposium last year sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates, Washington Post political reporter David Broder made this same point. "Whose campaign is it?" he asked. "We have accepted far too passively the notion that it is up to the candidates and their advisers to determine what takes place and what's talked about and how it's talked about in a Presidential campaign. The campaign belongs to the public."

Broder and other campaign observers, including Jim Lehrer, John Chancellor, David Gergen, John Brademas, Mort Zuckerman, and Lawrence Grossman, have endorsed the concept of debates tied to public financing. The Markle Commission, in the concluding recommendations of its report on the media and the electorate, urged the adoption of institutionalized debates. "Research shows the public pays more attention to the debates than any other campaign event," the report noted. "The Commission recommends that public funding of campaigns be conditioned on candidate commitment to participate and that the debates become permanent future fixtures of Presidential campaigns."

This issue has been given a certain urgency by recent reports on the status of the Treasury's Presidential campaign finance fund. The Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, John W. McGarry, earlier this month acknowledged that the fund was "heading for insolvency." Each year, fewer Americans check off the box on their income tax returns that directs \$1 to the fund, signaling their dissatisfaction with the quality of the campaigns this public financing provides. The Treasury has responded to the likely shortfall by proposing decreased public contributions to primary campaigns in order to ensure adequate finances for the general election.

The legislation Senator GRAHAM and I are today introducing represents a refinement of the original bill introduced in the last Congress. Although there was support for man-

dated debates within Congress, the media, and the parties, some elements of the legislation were criticized as "micromanaging." Although I continue to believe that these stipulations would have improved the quality of the debates, it is hoped that omitting them will facilitate the passage of the legislation.

In another important change, the bill we introduce today requires that the debates be sponsored by "a nonpartisan or bipartisan organization." The initial version of the legislation allowed sponsorship only by a nonpartisan organization. This change was made in order to include the possibility of sponsorship by the Commission on Presidential Debates, which skillfully staged the 1988 general election debates and which has continued to play an active and positive role in calling for institutionalized debates.

I thank my colleagues who cosponsored this measure in the last Congress, and I again urge support for the National Presidential Debates Act.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the bill in the RECORD following my remarks:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Presidential Debates Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. DEBATES BY GENERAL ELECTION CANDIDATES WHO RECEIVE AMOUNTS FROM THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 95 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9001 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 9003 the following new section:

"SEC. 9003A. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION DEBATES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the requirements specified in section 9003, in order to be eligible to receive any payments under section 9006, the candidates of a political party for the offices of President and Vice President shall agree in writing—

"(1) that the candidate for the office of President will participate in at least 4 debates, sponsored by a nonpartisan or bipartisan organization, with all other candidates for the office who are eligible under such section 9006; and

"(2) that the candidate for the office of Vice President will participate in at least 1 debate, sponsored by a nonpartisan or bipartisan organization, with all other candidates for that office who are eligible under such section 9006.

"(b) INELIGIBILITY.—If the Commission determines that a candidate failed to participate in a debate under subsection (a) and was responsible at least in part for such failure, the candidates of the party involved shall—

"(1) be ineligible to receive payments under section 9006; and

"(2) pay to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to the amount to the payments made to such candidates under such section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 95 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 9003 the following new item:

"Sec. 9003A. Presidential election debates."

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 9007(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9007(b)(5)) is amended

by inserting "or section 9003A(b)" after "this subsection" each place it appears.

SUPPORT FOR 42D BOMBARDMENT WING

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to extend tax relief benefits to members of the 42d Bombardment Wing from Loring, Air Force Base in Limestone, ME.

The members of the 42d left their homes and their families in Aroostook County last August in support of Operation Desert Shield. Since that time the majority of them have been stationed at our base on Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. On January 16 they began their participation in Operation Desert Storm.

You may not have heard of the 42d Bombardment Wing, but you know their work. These men and women fly and maintain the B-52 bombers. Granddaddy of the U.S. strategic bombers, the B-52's and their 20-ton payloads have knocked out military targets in Iraq and helped to ease the path of our ground troops into Kuwait and Iraq.

But even though the men and women of the 42d Bombardment Wing are fully involved in Operation Desert Storm, they have not been provided the tax relief offered to other servicemen and women and their families. They were also not included in the legislation adopted by the 102d Congress to provide retroactive tax relief to those in the combat zone in order to provide an extension of filing the 1990 tax returns.

The reason for this oversight is that Executive Order 12744, which formally designated the Persian Gulf combat zone, did not include Diego Garcia.

My legislation would provide an extension of time for filing 1990 tax returns until 6 months after these men and women return from Diego Garcia, which was the same timeframe provided for individuals under H.R. 4 as adopted by the 102d Congress. The bill also extends the tax relief provisions provided to individuals within a designated combat zone, such as relief from the deadlines for filing returns, paying taxes, and contesting tax liability.

The 42d may not have their planes sitting on runways in Saudi Arabia, but their contribution to the allied air campaign has been invaluable. It is a matter of equity that we extend to these hard-working, dedicated men and women and their families, the same tax benefits as their colleagues who have fought in the air war, albeit out of a different base.

A SALUTE TO NICOLET HIGH SCHOOL BAND

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to honor the Jean Nicolet High School Band of

Glendale, WI, which received a historic invitation to become the first American band to march in a parade through Red Square for the U.S.S.R. Victory Day Parade on May 9, 1991.

This unprecedented event presents a wonderful opportunity for students from different cultures to engage in exchange of ideas and to further knowledge and cooperation in the discipline of fine arts. Under the directorship of Nick White, who has been committed to music excellence for a number of years, the band's individual members have achieved numerous accomplishments and advanced status as young musicians. Some have been involved with the Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra while others have performed with the acclaimed Greater Milwaukee Youth Ensemble.

The event evolved from a relationship between Nicolet High School and its Muscovite sister school, the Gnessin Music College, Russia's foremost music institution for talented high-school-aged students. Following a United States visit from two of the school's Russian composers, the students received an unexpected invitation from the Moscow City Council to perform in the city's famed Red Square.

In celebration of the exchange in fine arts education, the students will participate in a joint concert—also the first of its kind—with the Gnessin students. The students will also perform for the world-renowned Moscow Circus during their tour.

The involvement of this talented band plays an important role in promoting education that extends beyond domestic borders as well as promoting increased awareness of the multifaceted Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I join all music enthusiasts and Wisconsin residents in saluting all members of the Jean Nicolet High School Band and Director Nick White for their unprecedented accomplishment. They are a shining example of the unlimited benefits that result from united cooperation and self-expression.

SACRIFICE AT HOME

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the attention of the American people and the world again turned urgently toward the Persian Gulf as the United States and the forces of the coalition nations engaged in a ground war in what is hopefully the final stage in the liberation of Kuwait and the defeat of Saddam Hussein.

I, like all Americans, am extremely proud of the dedication and sacrifice that our young men and women are displaying in the Persian Gulf.

Unfortunately, this weekend my attention also turned to Philadelphia where a 12-alarm fire in a center-city highrise raged out of control for more than 19 hours and claimed the lives of three brave south Philadelphia firefighters.

For the past several months, the American people have overwhelmingly shown their support for the brave men and women of our armed services as they were deployed to the

Middle East to check the naked aggression of a ruthless dictator. But in this time of international unrest, we Americans cannot afford to forget the other groups of brave men and women who serve our communities every day, willingly putting themselves in harm's way to protect our lives and property here at home.

Capt. David P. Holcombe, Firefighter Phyllis McAllister, and Firefighter James A. Chapple of Engine Company 11 from Philadelphia died in the blaze after they became trapped on the 28th floor of the 38-floor building. Not unlike the brave men and women who are now fighting in the deserts of Kuwait and Iraq, these three firefighters died while performing their chosen job, died while fulfilling a sense of duty to serve their neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, nothing can ever be said to ease the pain of the loss of life or make us forget this tragic event. Instead, I rise today to honor and remember the lives of David Holcombe, Phyllis McAllister, and James Chapple—three people who, in the ultimate sacrifice, gave their lives while trying to help others. The people of Philadelphia, as well as the rest of the United States, owe these and all firefighters a debt of gratitude for a commitment and dedication that often goes unrecognized.

THE CONCLUSION OF WAR IN THE PERSIAN GULF

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have watched the news in the past 3 days with both a sense of gratitude for the astoundingly low allied casualties and gains we have made and concern for the safe being of our troops. It seems that more than a month of air attacks did a tremendous job in preparing the battlefield and destroying the Iraqi Army's will to fight. That tens of thousands of Iraqi soldiers have surrendered to allied forces is testimony enough to the decisiveness of our battle plan, the quality of our equipment, and, above all, the outstanding efforts of our troops. Our successes to date are beyond anything we could have expected. While the situation remains fluid, it is now apparent this conflict will be over in short order. I simply cannot commend highly enough the skill and resolve of the United States and allied armed forces.

This ground war was something that I did not want to see. Yet, I believe it was also unavoidable. The last minute Soviet proposal for peace clearly fell short of the U.N. resolutions and coalition objectives. As such, it was unacceptable. Saddam Hussein met our demand for an unconditional, immediate withdrawal only with bluster, intransigence, and more Scud attacks. Sadly, his last Scud attack has done the most damage. Nearly 30 U.S. troops, at last report, were killed when a missile hit their barracks. More American men died in their sleep, far from Kuwait, than have died in all the ground fighting so far. I have stated throughout this conflict that peace and a ceasefire were easily achieved. Saddam Hussein merely had to comply with mandates of the world community.

While yesterday's radio order from Saddam to his troops to withdraw from Kuwait is encouraging, it shows he is not willing to unconditionally submit. Where is his rejection of the Iraqi annexation of Kuwait? Where is his admission of responsibility for what he has done? Why cannot he comply with the U.N. resolutions? I wholly support continuing our military pressure until he is willing to fully acknowledge his defeat and own up to the repulsive atrocities and damage his army has inflicted upon the people and nation of Kuwait. I long for a quick peace, but I am unwilling to see Saddam escape scot-free from his crimes.

Saddam Hussein has brought this ground war upon himself. Now, he will lose the war he started. It is already apparent that his army will be crushed in short order, and Kuwait will be free. Most importantly, Saddam Hussein will cease to be a threat to the region. When we have come so far, it would be unconscionable to let Saddam slip away now without forcing him to comply with the U.N. resolutions.

I pray for continued success and for the lives of our brave fighting men and women. Their efforts have been more than heroic. I look forward to their quick return home and a lasting peace.

CORRECTIONS TO H.R. 192, THE FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REFORM AND CAPITAL ENFORCEMENT ACT.

HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1991, I introduced, along with eight of my colleagues, H.R. 192, the Financial Industry Reform and Capital Enforcement Act. This legislation is substantially similar to H.R. 1992 which was introduced in the last Congress. Unfortunately, due to clerical error, there were several mistakes and one omission in the legislation. Rather than reintroduce the legislation at this time, I would like to announce our intent to make the corrections and to provide the correct material below. The bill should be corrected to read as follows:

Page 12, Line 11, after "institution," and before "an" add "in".

Page 12, Line 11, strike all that follows after "amount" up to but not including "until" on Line 14 and insert "... equal to the capital deficiency set forth in the notification described in paragraph (1) of this subsection . . ."

Page 13, Line 11, after "and" and before "a", insert "... upon appointment of a conservator pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection . . ."

Page 13, Line 21, strike all that follows after "amounts" up to but not including "may" on line 22 and insert "... provided under any bond, guarantee or similar undertaking, deposit or capital contribution, if any, maintained pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph . . ."

Page 16, Line 6, strike all that follows after "section," up to but not including "if," on line 11 and insert "... the amounts provided under any bond, guarantee or similar undertaking, deposit or capital contribution, if any, maintained pursuant to subparagraph

(A) of paragraph (2) of this subsection may be appropriated by the appropriate Federal regulatory agency, and may be infused into the insured depository institution being divested"

Page 17, Line 14, strike all between "amounts" and "..." and insert "... provided under any bond, guarantee or similar undertaking, deposit or capital contribution, if any, maintained pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of this subsection".

Page 25, Line 19, insert the following new paragraph (3) and renumber the existing paragraph (3) as paragraph (4):

"(3) No bank holding company which becomes a depository institution holding company and no depository institution holding company which did not at any time prior to becoming a depository institution holding company directly or indirectly engage in insurance agency or real estate brokerage activities not permissible for bank holding companies under section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended (12 U.S.C. 2843(c)(8)), unless—

"(i) such activities shall be conducted through an existing insurance agency or real estate brokerage firm, as the case may be, acquired directly or indirectly by such depository institution holding company or through any successor to such insurance agency or real estate brokerage firm, and

"(ii) such acquired insurance agency or real estate brokerage firm shall have been actively engaged in such insurance agency or real estate brokerage activities during the five years preceding the date of enactment of this Act, and

"(iii) such acquired insurance agency or real estate brokerage firm may be legally affiliated with an insured depository institution under the laws of the State in which such depository institution holding company controls an insured depository institution and in which such acquired insurance agency or real estate brokerage firm is chartered or licensed: *Provided further*, That the activities of such acquired insurance agency or real estate brokerage firm that is affiliated with such depository institution holding company may be engaged in only to the extent permissible under the laws of said State."

GRACE BARBARA GEORGE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize an outstanding individual who has ventured forth to enhance the educational capabilities of our youth, Ms. Grace Barbara George.

In 1959, Ms. George began working as a schoolteacher. She specialized in teaching classes that were designated for intellectually gifted children. She remained in this position until she began working as a language arts specialist as well as a teacher for P.S. 262 in district 16 in 1973. Her responsibilities were to provide instruction to students who were eligible for special programs while utilizing the various techniques of small group instruction.

After much success, she began working for the Queens Regional Office of Special Education. She worked as a teacher trainer in reading. She worked with teachers in monthly workshops focusing on staff development.

This provided on-site training to help teachers become more effective in the classroom.

Ms. George became the regional coordinator of the Chapter I Program in 1981. Her primary duties were monitoring the budget, working with principals, special education supervisors, and teachers. In addition, she worked as a regional coordinator in the summer months of 1982 and 1983.

She progressed in the ranks and became personnel director in 1983. As the director, Ms. George was in charge of personnel functions for over 2,500 educators, in addition to a host of other duties. Later, she became a high school placement officer and articulation coordinator, in which she was mainly responsible for placement of special education students in appropriate high school settings.

In late 1985, George moved into the division of special education as executive assistant to the assistant superintendent for regional programs. She remained in this position until 1986, when she became executive assistant to the chief administrator. Among her many tasks, she provided technical advice and assistance relative to the implementation and efficient functioning of the division's regional operations. The executive assistant is very important within this department due to the responsibility of assisting the chief administrator, the superintendent, as well as other high level administrators.

Presently, Ms. George is the deputy superintendent for community school district 32. She has held this position since 1988. Some of her responsibilities include coordinating pupil personnel services, advising and interpreting new legislation and regulation, accounting for accurate delivery of instructional services, and supervising the entire District Educational Field Trip Program.

Individuals such as Grace Barbara George are valuable assets to our Nation's educational system. The hard work that she has done is of great significance. I would like to commend her for her contributions and urge her to continue her endeavors as an administrator in the New York City school system.

PROUD TO BE THEIR CONGRESSMAN

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this country hasn't been so united in a common purpose in 45 years.

I'd like to tell you about one family that symbolizes that unity.

Pam Waterston of North Creek, New York, is only 21 but she's one of the reasons, as General Schwarzkopf said, our troops are going around, through, under, and on top of Iraqi troops.

Pam Waterston operates a 10,000-pound forklift for the 82d Airborne, and keeps the massive flow of materials moving from ships to railcars on their way to the front.

She is proof, Mr. Speaker, that women can get the job done, and have a place in our all-volunteer military.

She belongs to quite a family. Her mother, Terry, is area coordinator for Operation Uplift, which collects donations for our troops in the gulf. She and her two sisters, Shirley and Bobby served in the U.S. Marine Corps about the same time that I did and she is vice commander of American Legion Post 629 in North Creek.

One of Terry's sons is Sgt. Barry Waterston Jr., a member of the 10th Mountain Army National Guard.

Another son, T. Sgt. Rob Laber, is now serving in Holland but may be called up to serve in the gulf.

Mr. Speaker, it's an all-American family from an all-American town, and I'm proud to be their Congressman.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EARNING BY LEARNING BILL

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this summer, the Early Childhood Department at West Georgia College in Carrollton, GA, carried out a pilot program designed to motivate youngsters to read by giving them a monetary incentive. The program, called "Earning by Learning," has already had a positive impact on my district. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 95 to authorize the use of funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for programs to provide monetary compensation to students for reading and reporting on books, so that the benefits of the program, which is a proven success, can be extended to youngsters across the country.

In the program, third and fourth grade students, who were considered to be at risk of not learning to read, were given \$2 for each book they read. The children were allowed, with some adult guidance, to choose the books they wanted to read. After reading each book, the child reported on it to a volunteer. Each child had a form to keep track of how many books were read during the summer, and the forms were used to determine how much money the child had earned by the end of the program.

At the end of the program, 282 at-risk third and fourth graders had read 3,801 books. The total cost of the pilot program—less than \$10,000—was money well spent. However, a program like this may not be eligible for funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I urge you to cosponsor this important bill.

For information on the Earning by Learning Program or to cosponsor H.R. 95, contact Siobhan Rieger on my staff at 255-4501.

WOMEN'S HEALTH EQUITY ACT OF 1991

HON. JOLENE UNSOELD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, the Women's Health Equity Act introduced follows on the work in the last Congress to draw attention to the fact that women deserve equal attention in medical research, services, and prevention.

There is an abundance of anecdotal evidence to suggest that scientists study white male subjects disproportionately because they are easier and less expensive to study. Easier because scientists do not have to account for monthly cycles, pregnancy, or menopause. Yet it is because of these variables that it is so important to include women in clinic trials—because all of these variables still exist when scientists and doctors apply research to women.

Let me give you just one example. The Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging, a study funded by the National Institute on Aging, began in 1958 but did not include women until 1978, leaving a 20-year gap in the research.

In addition, the Society for the Advancement of Women's Health Research reports that "research on diseases unique to women or more prevalent in women—osteoporosis, menopause, breast cancer, postpartum depression, ovarian cancer—is often underfunded." These are very real issues for all of us—issues we are addressing through the Women's Health Equity Act of 1991.

Since we started this battle at the beginning of the 101st Congress, the National Institutes of Health has created an Office for Research on Women's Health, and we have acted on 10 separate bills relating to women's health and research. We must continue along this path in the 102d Congress. To show my commitment, I have not only cosponsored the Women's Health Equity Act of 1991, but each of the 22 bills in the act as well.

REMEDIOS DIAZ-OLIVER: A CUBAN-AMERICAN WHO DOES NOT REST ON HER SUCCESS

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize today one of my constituents, Remedios Diaz-Oliver, who recently was featured in the International Business Chronicle as one of America's leading businesswomen involved in international trade.

Ms. Diaz-Oliver represents the can-do spirit that continues to make America the most productive nation in the world. The 52-year-old president of American International Container, Inc., was selected by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as the 1990 Businesswoman of the Year, and also received the 1990 Florida Export Achievement Award from U.S. Secretary of Commerce Robert Mosbacher.

American International Container is one of many south Florida firms, founded by Cuban

political refugees, which has helped America win overseas markets. Ms. Diaz-Oliver's firm was honored especially for expanding "sales of American products to areas that were originally controlled by European manufacturers." It distributes thousands of containers—everything from perfume bottles to large plastic jugs—for over 150 companies. Current overseas markets include Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Singapore, Europe, the Caribbean, and Latin America, with overseas sales and warehouses in San Jose, Costa Rica; Caracas, Venezuela; Mexico City, Mexico, and Guatemala City, Guatemala.

Thirty years after leaving Cuba with her husband, an infant daughter, and a few dollars in her pocket, Remedios has achieved prominence at the local, national, and international levels. She is among only 6 Hispanic women who serve on the boards of Fortune 1,000 companies. She's also president of the Cuban Women's Club, a trustee of the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, and the treasurer of the Florida State Commission on Hispanic Affairs.

President Bush recently appointed Remedios as one of three advisers on international trade for the Advisory Committee for Trade Policies and Negotiations. She also was selected to represent the President at the inauguration ceremonies for Uruguayan President Luis Lacalle.

In a recent interview with the International Business Chronicle, Ms. Diaz-Oliver emphasized that the old-fashioned values of hard work and discipline are the ingredients of her success. Luis Sabines, president of the Miami-based Latin Chamber of Commerce and Industry said, "I admire her human quality. I don't know where she gets all the energy to support so many organizations with time and money."

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JUDGE JOSEPH BRANCH

HON. TIM VALENTINE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to one of North Carolina's greatest citizens and public servants, Judge Joseph Branch, who died last week.

Judge Branch was a member of the North Carolina Supreme Court for 20 years and served as chief justice from 1979 until his retirement in 1986. Prior to his service on the court, Judge Branch's public career included four terms in the State House of Representatives, service as town attorney for Enfield, NC, and appointment as legislative counsel to two Governors.

I had the privilege of knowing Judge Branch personally for many years and take great pride in representing his home town and county in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He was a close friend and adviser who could always be counted on for wise and judicious counsel. With former Governor Dan K. Moore, who appointed him to the supreme court and under whom we both served, Joe Branch was my political mentor, inspiration,

and role model. In all my public life, I have never known a more intelligent and fair-minded person or an individual of greater integrity.

Judge Branch, I am proud to say, was a strong Democrat and an outstanding leader of the Democratic Party in Halifax County and across the State. At the same time, he clearly recognized the limits of party politics and the need for objectivity and fairness both as a judge and as a political leader. He was principled without being partisan and always put the needs of North Carolina citizens ahead of any party considerations.

As an associate justice and then as chief justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court, Judge Branch exemplified the highest ideals of judicial service. No attorney, no plaintiff, no defendant who appeared before Judge Branch's court could ever complain of unfair treatment. Judge Branch possessed a model judicial temperament as well as deep knowledge of the law and acute sensitivity to the effects of the legal system on every individual who encountered it.

Judge Branch's wife Frances and the other members of his family can take great pride in his life and accomplishments. Our State is a much better place because of his contributions. Everyone who came in contact with Judge Branch was ennobled by his presence, and we are all diminished by his loss.

North Carolinians in public life can only strive to reach the standards that Judge Branch established. Every citizen of our State is forever in his debt.

JUDGE DONALD LEE MANFORD

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, a good friend and former Missouri State Senate colleague, Judge Donald Lee Manford, died recently at the age of 56. He was an outstanding Missourian, who devoted most of his life toward legislative and judicial endeavors.

I had the privilege to work with Judge Manford in the Missouri Senate, where he served as the chairman of the prestigious appropriations committee. During this time, he built a reputation for fiscal restraint and thoroughness. In 1979, he was appointed judge of the Missouri Court of Appeals, in Kansas City, and served until his untimely death on February 12, 1991.

He was my friend, and I will miss him, and I know well that he will be missed by those who had the privilege to know him or serve with him.

Judge Manford earned his law degree from the University of Kansas and went on to serve as a Missouri assistant attorney general. He was elected to the Missouri House of Representatives for 2 years and the Missouri Senate for 10 years. Judge Manford served his State and country well. In addition to his contributions to the State of Missouri, he served in the U.S. Navy during the Korean war.

Judge Manford is survived by his wife, Judy; his mother, Juanita Manford; three daughters; a son; two sisters; and five grandchildren.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COAL MINERS JUSTICE ACT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today, along with 29 of my colleagues, the Coal Miners Justice Act. This act will benefit over 60,000 disabled coal miners who have been denied essential black lung benefits to which they were legally entitled and which Congress intended they receive. This is an egregious situation which demands swift remedy.

The responsibility for handling claims for black lung benefits was originally assigned to the Social Security Administration, but was transferred to the Department of Labor in 1977. Congress explicitly directed the Labor Department to use eligibility criteria no more restrictive than those used by the Social Security Administration.

Despite this mandate, the Department of Labor established more restrictive eligibility requirements which differed significantly from those used by the Social Security Administration. As a result, thousands of miners were unjustly denied black lung benefits Congress had intended they receive.

In December 1988, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Pittston Coal Group versus Sebben that the Department of Labor had failed to follow the directive of Congress and ruled that its

eligibility criteria was more restrictive than those of the Social Security Administration. However, the Court refused to grant relief to the many individuals whose claims were adjudicated under the Department of Labor's improperly restrictive criteria because those claimants had technically failed to pursue their legal appeals on a timely basis. It is ludicrous to penalize these disabled miners who were pressured by a Federal department not to seek benefits.

My legislation requires the Department of Labor to review the claims of those who were denied benefits under the Department of Labor's regulations using the Social Security Administration's criteria, and to allow such claimants to offer additional evidence of disability. While many of these individuals may have no claim, and many of those eligible for benefits have already died as a result of black lung, those who were unjustly denied benefits deserve to receive them.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO BUDGET AGREEMENT

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1991

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, rising unemployment, mortgage foreclosures, business and personal bankruptcies, and a slump in economic activity are putting new strains on

the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction law. People are saying we should suspend the deficit reduction targets and indulge in massive spending to pump prime the economy and to create more jobs.

If we listen to these voices, last year's pay-as-you-go budget agreement designed to bring the annual deficit down by almost \$500 billion in the next 4 years would end up in shreds.

The Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction law is the kind of discipline we need to eliminate the deficit, and I shudder to think how large our deficit would be without it.

Under our new, pay-as-you-go system, we cannot spend more on one program without taking the money away from something else, or we must develop a new revenue source such as a tax or fee to cover the additional cost. That is the real discipline in the budget process that I want kept in place, regardless of the pressures created by the recession.

We should keep the pay-as-you-go policy to bring down the deficit.

The rewards will be great. We can expect lower interest rates and more investment in jobs, infrastructure, business, education, the environment, and housing. By sticking to our guns, the deficit in 1995 could be less than \$100 billion, a deficit that would be less than 1 percent of our gross national product for the first time in 20 years.

That is a goal worth achieving, and our children and grandchildren will thank us for it.